

1475.
AN ATTEMPT

TO EXPOSE
THE WEAKNESS, FALLACY,
AND ABSURDITY,

OF THE
UNITARIAN OR SOCINIAN ARGUMENTS

AGAINST

THE DIVINITY OF THE SON OF GOD,
AND THE WORSHIP CHRISTIANS PAY TO HIM;

IN THREE PARTS.

PART I.

Answer to the Writings of Mr Frennd of Cambridge.

PART II.

A Reply to a Pamphlet published in May last, by T. F.
Palmer of Dundee.

PART III.

An Address to Real Believers in Christ—On his Character,
and the respect due to it, with a View of the Scripture-
Trinity.

BY ALEXANDER PIRIE, *✍*

Minister of the Gospel at *NEWBURGH*.

As Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also
resist the truth. 2 Tim. iii. 8.

P E R T H :

PRINTED BY R. MORISON JUNIOR,
FOR R. MORISON AND SON, BOOKSELLERS, PERTH.
M,DCC,XCII.

AN ATTEMPT

TO EXAMINE
THE WEAKNESS, FALLACY,
AND ABSURDITY,

OF THE
UNITARIAN OR SOCinian ARGUMENTS

AGAINST
THE DIVINITY OF THE SON OF GOD,
AND THE WORTH OF HIS SACRIFICE.



IN
PART II.
A Reply to a Pamphlet published in May 1841, by J. T. Paine of London.

PART III.
An Address to the Unitarians in 1841—On the Christian
and the Jewish (and other) views of the Old Testament.

BY
ALEXANDER TILLY,
Minister of the Gospel at New Bedford.

As James and James's Edinburgh, 1841, 10s. 6d. and 12s. 6d.

PART II.
PRINTED BY R. MORRISON, JUNIOR,
FOR R. MORRISON AND SON, (BOOKSELLERS), 11, N. B. ST. 1841.

P R E F A C E.

TO write in support of Truth, when opposed with violence, cannot, I apprehend, be considered as unseasonable. When men of talents, under the most specious pretences of zeal for the Christian Religion, are constantly uniting their most strenuous efforts to subvert her essential principles—When a frantic Enthusiasm, worthy of a Ranter or a Fifth-monarchy-man of the last Century, under a pretext of refining Christianity from corruptions, would abandon all her peculiar doctrines, and only retain her moral system, that by these means she may form a creed suited to the taste of the Deist, the Jew, the Mahometan and the Pagan, and still calls this creed Christian—When, in short, the Press daily pours out swarms of pamphlets, circulated by the most active zeal, all tending by false criticism to unsettle the meaning of words, to violate every established rule of interpreting Writings—tending not to reason, but to terrify us out of Religion and

common sense by the mere dint of roaring—in this case *Difficile est fatyram non scribere*; ‘it is hard to write,’ for who can reason down Nonsense; but ‘harder to forbear,’ as our silence might be construed as an abandonment of the Standard of Truth in the day of war, when all the weapons in the armory of Satan seem to be employed against her.

It may seem improper, that I should have confined my attack chiefly to the publications of two brothers of inferior rank in the learned Socinian Fraternity. The reason is, These are well known in this country; one of them is of a very late date, and makes the greatest noise at present; besides, they comprehend every argument, and all the burlesque, Socinians have yet published against us. Whether a Priestly or a Palmer write, we have nothing new—it is always *Another of the same*. Hence an Answer to one is an Answer to all.

The charge in the introduction to this work is founded on Dr Priestly’s idea of Spirit.

P R E F A C E.

v

Spirit. That he professes Materialism is well known. Spirit, on that hypothesis, is not a substance distinct from matter; but a quality of it in a certain state of organization. If so, it is vain, it is unphilosophical, to except even the Great Spirit of the universe from this general idea. For as we can have no conception of powers or operations, but of such as are suggested to us by our own consciousness, or by the powers and operations of our own spirits, it is evident we conceive nothing of the highest spirit of all, but as one of the same generic nature with our own, although of an higher order. If quality, then, be the character by which spirit is distinguished from matter or body, every species of spirit must be included in this general idea, or in what Logicians call *Genus*.

If this performance shall meet the public approbation, or shall be judged fit to serve the purpose of establishing the minds of men in the faith of the Son of God, and to guard the honest though weak Christian against the insidious arts of cunning men, who lie in

wait to deceive,—the Author proposes to publish his Views on the many other points in dispute between us and the Socinians—points of the last importance to the happiness of christians for time and eternity. Although the Socinian tenets be supported by all the power, and varnished by all the address of the great modern Philosopher, the Author hopes to prove, that his religious creed is a system of contradictions, and that he has not adopted a single theological idea, that is not equally repugnant with Scripture, with sound philosophy, and with common sense.

AN

AN ATTEMPT
TO EXPOSE THE
WEAKNESS, FALLACY, AND ABSURDITY
OF THE
SOCINIAN ARGUMENTS, &c.

PART I.

An Answer to a Pamphlet, entitled, An Address to the Inhabitants of Cambridge, &c. by William Frend.

THIS is an age of Discoveries. Islands after islands have been lately discovered by our navigators; but Dr Priestly and his coadjutors have done more—they have discovered a new God and a new Jesus, hitherto unknown even in Britain, that country so long distinguished for intellectual improvements. They have done more still—their well known philanthropy has disposed them to publish these Discoveries to the World, with a view to dispel that gross darkness, which has so long enveloped the Nations, and concealed the true object of worship from their beclouded eyes. Yea,
to

to accommodate the lower classes, the quintessence of large volumes has been extracted, and sold in penny and two-penny pamphlets, and even distributed *gratis* among thousands.

Religion is of all other concerns the most important : and as there can be no true religion, where the true God is not known, I have examined the subject of these Discoveries with particular attention, and now presume to publish the result to the world.

Dr Priestly is the Nebuchadnezzar of the age. Comparing his new God with the God of the Scripture, I find the former as unlike the latter, as the golden Image set up in the plains of Dura was. The God of Dura and the God of Birmingham are both Idols; both the work of men : only the Babylonish God was the workmanship of men's hands, but the other the production of men's brains.—God is a Spirit. But says the Doctor, a spirit is not a substance distinct from matter, or that can exist independent of matter; it is merely a quality resulting from a certain organization of matter, on which organization it is so absolutely dependent, that in it it “lives and moves and has its being.” The necessary consequence of this doctrine is plain —The Doctor's God is not the God who made the world, but the world made him. So soon as the universe had got herself set to rights, and all the parts of the vast machine properly

properly organized, she astonished feels a wondrous quality start up, as the necessary result of this fabrication; a quality which shot through all her frame, and instantly communicated consciousness at least to some, and life and motion to every wheel of the stupendous machinery. Here is a God for you, Reader! A God, which you nor your fathers ever knew. A God, who depends for his very existence and the exercise of his powers on the present organization of the heavens and earth, and consequently if this organization or systematical arrangement of these heavens and earth shall perish, this God must necessarily perish with them; as a quality, the result of an arrangement, must unavoidably be destroyed with that arrangement.—Again, if the universe shall happen to assume a new organization or structure of parts, so as to form a new heavens and a new earth, a new God will be the necessary consequence; as spirits seem to differ according to the diversification of animal organization. What kind of a God we shall then have, the day only will declare.

The God of the Scriptures, on the other hand, or the only true God, is he who made the heavens and the earth; of whom, and through whom, and to whom are all things. He was before all things, and exists absolutely independent of any or of all his creatures.

We

We must conclude, then, that the Dr's God, however immense in stature and magnificence, is not the God of the universe, but the monstrous production of a prolific imagination. So true is it still of modern philosophy——
 “The world by wisdom knew not God.”

Such is the deity however, which philosophic pride has set up; and all nations are commanded to worship it, with an air of dignified authority, and in terms very similar to those, in which Nebuchadnezzar enjoined the worship of his favourite God. Whosoever falls not down and worships my God, says the king, “shall be cast into the burning fiery furnace.” Whosoever will not fall down before my God, or presumes to worship any other, says the philosopher, he shall be cast into the lake of fire, which burns for ever and ever. Did Nebuchadnezzar, too, send forth heralds every where, to publish his edicts among all people, nations and tongues? The Dr has done so likewise. Heralds upon heralds have appeared, with the loudest vociferations and unremitting zeal, to enjoin compliance with the philosophic edict by all that is dreadful in eternity. But as many are more easily gulled, than terrified into obedience; his heralds, like those of Babylon, have studied also to charm the people, and to set them a-dancing to “the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, dulcimer,

dulcimer and all kinds of music, some airy, and some more solemn. Light, sprightly airs are best calculated for catching the popular ear, and hence Piper T. F. Palmer, who, whether he sets the Scripture to music or any other writing, is sure to set it to some merry jig, without a jarring note of gravity or even decency,—has been more successful in making proselytes to his master's creed, than even Brother Friend, who plays on the sacred Lyre with a more serious and solemn sound.

Propagated by craft, and supported by unabating effort, the delusion has spread; and many of the unprincipled, weak and volatile people have been induced to embrace a religion, which, alas! will teach them to live disputants and to die Atheists.

As the Heralds of this new Religion are so very clamorous, and bring in such heavy charges against the leading articles of faith, so generally received among Protestants, I propose to set before my fellow-christians the weakness, fallacy and absurdity of these Gentlemen's arguments, lest the more simple and unwary should be *roared* out of religion and common sense by big swelling words of vanity, or *decoyed* by the craftiness of men who lie in wait to deceive. With this view I shall first call the reader's attention to a performance, entitled—An Address to the Inhabitants

bitants of Cambridge and its neighbourhood, exhorting them to turn from the false worship of three persons to the worship of the one true God; by W. Friend.—A pamphlet, which in a few pages contains all the arguments on his side of the question, while it also speaks the words of soberness, although not of truth.

Worshipping false gods, or Idolatry, is the leading article of accusation against us: and a heavy charge it undoubtedly is—if valid, it must incur the highest penalties in the book of God. But what are these false gods? Not the Heathen idols forbidden in the decalogue of Moses; not the beast or his images reprobated in the Revelation; not even Mahomet the false prophet. Against these gods this author's zeal is not directed. What then, you will say? Hear it, Protestant reader, and hear it with astonishment—You worship Christ the Son of the living God, and the Spirit of God!

Let us see against whom this charge can be levelled in justice. Worship involves in its idea love, reverence and obedience. Christ tells us, If we love any person or thing on earth more than him, we are not worthy of him; and that we are his friends, if we do whatsoever he commands us. Common sense as well as an Apostle teaches us—His servants ye are whom ye obey. In this view

view, I am afraid, Christ will be found to have few worshippers among all the nations called by his name. One year, during the reign of Henry II. of England, vast sums were offered at the shrine of Thomas Becket at Canterbury; something considerable at the shrine of Mary, but not a farthing at Christ's shrine. Did these votaries worship Christ? Whoever pays greater deference to the authority of men, in matters of religion, than to the authority of Christ, he is none of his, or worships him not in truth. This at once frees millions of christians in name, from the above charge.

But where lies the crime of paying divine honours to the Son of God? Hear the Author: "You worship alas! other gods, forgetting what is said in the Scriptures, 'Thou shalt not bow down to them nor serve them.'" * The Scripture here quoted is the second Commandment of the decalogue; and ere it can suit this writer's purpose, he must prove--That Jesus Christ is a graven image which men have made; for so the law reads, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image or any likeness, &c." He must prove, too, that Christ was one of the heathen gods; for this law is thus explained, Deut. vi. 14. "Ye shall not go after other gods, of the gods of the people, which are round about you."

round about you.”—Again, Is it unlawful to bow to Jesus Christ? Are we not expressly told that it is the divine purpose, “That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and in earth, and under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the father.”—Moreover, worshipping one, and serving him as Lord of our faith and conscience are synonymous terms; and hence this commandment is translated, “Thou shalt not bow down to them nor serve them.” According to this Author, then, it is unlawful, ~~yea~~ a damnable crime to serve Jesus Christ the Lord, or to obey him as the Head and Lord of our religion. Yet Paul glories in being a servant of Jesus Christ; and this is the characteristic of the Apostles and all Christians, “We serve the Lord Christ.” The Scripture here says, “them.”

Now, Reader, is not this a jewel of a Commentator? Did I say, you will allow that no man endowed with the common sense of reason, common sense, or common honesty could ever have dreamed of such a comment.

These kind Unitarians try to reduce Christians to a dilemma indeed. The Scriptures assure us, That we cannot honour the Father, unless we honour the Son. ~~even as~~ we honour the Father. That we cannot glorify God the Father, but by bowing the knee to

Jesus, and confessing that he is Lord of all—by hearing or obeying him in all things whatsoever he has said to us.”—On the other hand, these Rabbis tell us—If we bow down to Jesus Christ, or serve him—If we honour him as we honour the Father, we shall never be forgiven, neither in this nor the coming world. What, then, shall Christians do? Why tell these High-Priests, “Whether it be right in the sight of God, to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye!”

We are certain there is a day coming, when even these haughty men, who now disdain to call upon the name of the Lord Jesus, shall be constrained to bow to him. We must all appear before his Judgment-seat, where the sacred Oracles assure us, Every knee shall bow to him, and every tongue confess that he is Lord. If this be Idolatry, Unitarians and Deists must be guilty of it, unless they can find out some asylum for themselves, neither in heaven, nor earth, nor under the earth.

Even Mr Frend himself seems to admit the propriety of addressing Christ in prayer, when he appears the second time. In answer to the argument taken from Stephen at the point of death calling on the Lord of glory, saying, “Lord Jesus receive my spirit,” he replies, “He saw Christ in glory,

and seeing him, made with great propriety this address. If any of you, my brethren, should see our Saviour in the same circumstances, such an address would be very proper." * Is not this curious enough? Does it not say, 1st, That Jesus Christ is a proper object of prayer, or that he is not a false god? otherwise, how could it be proper to make such an address to him in any circumstances whatever? 2ndly, That he was a proper object of worship, when the Apostles saw him in glory on the holy mount. 3dly, That it will be proper for all men to worship the Saviour at his glorious appearing to judge the world. Then we may justly consider him as "the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ." 4thly, That it is improper to address an *unseen* God, as Christ is only to be addressed in prayer when we see him in glory!!

Now I would ask Mr Friend, How then can we address the Father in prayer, since he is, not only unseen, but invisible? And if we must worship the Father although unseen by our eyes of flesh; why may we not worship the Son *merely* because we see him not in glory? Do we not believe that he is in glory, and is he not really so? Why not then address him as seeing him by faith, since faith gives as real a subsistence to unseen things, as the eye does to things seen? But

But "Consult common sense. Could God lie in the womb of a woman? Could God expire on the Cross? Could God be buried in the grave? Shocking suppositions!"* So they are, Mr Friend; but they revert on yourself. The Unitarian or Materialist's God was hatched into life in the womb of matter, and will expire, if not on the Cross, at least at the stake, when Nature, like the Phoenix, sets fire to her nest, and burns herself with all her crimes about her. But Christians suppose no such absurdities. They have as much sense as to know, that there is a difference between the Logos or Word, who was in the beginning with God and was God, and the flesh and blood of which he took part and tabernacled in it. They know, That his flesh and blood did lie in the womb, expire on the Cross and lie in a grave, while he who took hold of it, or partook of it, survived. Whether in the glorious and majestic "form of God," or in the humble "form of a servant," the divine Logos in the man "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day and for ever." Nor do they reckon it difficult to understand that expression—"God purchased the Church with his own blood." Here is only a common figure of speech, by which, what is most strictly attributable to one, is ascribed to another, on ac-

B 3

count

* Page 6.

count of their close connection. This, however, it seems, is too high for the genius of an Unitarian. "I have won the bell"—says this Schoolboy; and none of his fellows mistake him.—Shocking supposition! Heresy! A lie! Nonsense! cries a cold, dull Unitarian critic—He ascribes to himself what is due to his cock!

But, says this Author, "We give Christ all due honour, but we cannot without blasphemy make him equal to our Maker." * But does not your party allow, That he is to be the maker of the new world? The Creator of the new heavens and the new earth? Does this require less divine power than to create the old heavens and earth? Yea, will he not make all men, when he raises them from the dead? When he shall change our vile bodies, and fashion them like his own most glorious body? Is it easier to make a body of glory than to make a vile body, a body of humiliation?—Thus you not only make him equal to your Maker, but your Maker himself. This he shall be: but whether he will make you "a vessel to honour or dishonour, the day will declare.

I know there are of your *Dons*, who aver, that the Resurrection in the New Testament only means a resurrection of morals, not of bodies.—To such Christians I have nothing
to

to say—An Apostle of Christ has already delivered them to Satan, (1 Tim. i. 20. 2 Tim. ii. 17, 18.) and all the friends of God and man will say, Amen.

But Christ says “The father is greater than I.” Yes, W. Friend; but has he not said also, “My father and I are one?” This your bigotry would not suffer you to produce.—But you say “Scripture cannot contradict itself.” Well; but here are two seemingly contradictory; nor can you reconcile them. To a man knowing the Scriptures there is no contradiction here. The Father, as preparing a body for his Son and sending him into the world, is greater than he: The Son as the divine Logos, who from the beginning was God, possessed of all the powers and perfections of the Father, and doing all his works, was one with the Father.

It is added, That Jesus said to the man who called him “Good Master—Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is God.” Yet the Scripture calls Barnabas “a good man; yea, it divides mankind into two classes—“the good and the bad, the just and the unjust.” Why, then, does our Lord reprove this man for calling him *good*?—He knew that the man only considered him as a mere man, a teacher at best, and perhaps an impostor. The epithet in this view was a mere hypocritical
compliment,

compliment, and as such merited a reprimand. But, although human nature, even in our Saviour, was not absolutely and underviedly good, yet in so far as the father and he were one, he undoubtedly was good, and that infallibly and originally. In him dwells all the fullness of God, and consequently all his goodness. But,

2ndly, It seems we worship another false god still! "Your addressees to the Holy Ghost have no foundation in Scripture--- They are strictly prohibited by the first Command--- *Thou shalt have no other gods before me.*" Does this Author know what he says! He tells us, That as the spirit of a man is in a man, so the spirit of God is in God, and so not distinct from him. If so, Is the spirit of God, then, a false god? Or is it possible that God can have forbidden us to worship his spirit? When we venerate a man, do we pay no regard to the spirit that is in him? Is this worshipping another man?

Nor can reason see any impropriety in a separate address to the Spirit either of God or man. The spirit of a man is frequently spoken of, as in some respect distinct from a man. Thus David in the Psalms often calls on his soul to bless the Lord—"Bless the Lord, O my soul." Jacob says, "O my soul, come not thou into their secrets!" Is this an address to another man? No. Neither does
any

any rational christian, in addressing the spirit of God, consider this spirit as another or a separate God. Yet when he reads such expressions as these—"By *his spirit* he garnished the heavens—I will send you *another comforter the spirit* of truth—When *he* is come, *he* shall lead you into all truth." What can he conclude, but that as this spirit has a peculiar agency assigned to him, a particular address founded on, and referring to that agency, is not unscriptural. Particularly when he finds Jehovah himself enjoining an address of that very kind, when he commanded Ezekiel to prophecy over the dry bones, saying, "Come from the four winds, O breath, and breathe upon these slain, that they may live." Now that this breath is the spirit of God, is clear from the context, Ez. xxxvii. 9, 13, 15. "Ye shall know that I am Jehovah, when I have opened your graves, O my people, and brought you up out of your graves, and shall put *my spirit* in you, and ye shall live."

—Was this a breach of the first commandment? you dare not say it. Why, then, blame the christian for a similar address?

By this, however, I do not pretend to apologize for a variety of expressions in the English book of common prayer. Many of them are calculated to mislead the weak christian into the idea of three Gods, as distinct

distinct from each other as three men are. Such expressions are highly culpable, unexampled in scripture,—culled only from the Athanasian creed, that system of metaphysics, dressed up “in words which man’s wisdom teacheth.”—Yet the Unitarian creed is much more distant from the truth. A divinity existing in absolute unity is an idea equally unfounded in revelation, in fact and in observation. Such a deity the eye never saw, nor the ear heard of. Revelation speaks to man: it conveys ideas of unseen things in words originally descriptive of things seen. And does true philosophy know any other principle of reasoning?

What can we reason, but from what we know? And when did even Dr Priestly see a being existing in absolute unity? or has he been in heaven, and “found out the almighty to perfection?”

3dly. We are blamed for worshipping the Trinity. Trinity, says Mr Friend, “is a Latin word.”* Well, but God is a Saxon word; and who made the Saxon tongue more divine than the Latin?—But it “is not found in the scriptures.” Very true, let the word therefore be omitted—Let us no more say —“O ever blessed Trinity,” because this is not scripture phraseology. Yet we must regard three in prayer—An Apostle has taught us to pray, That “the grace of our Lord

Jesus

Jesus Christ, the love of the Father, and the communion of the Holy Spirit may be with us all." Whatever blessings Paul wishes to descend on the Churches, he prays that they may be granted by God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ. Yea, he tells us, "through Christ we have access by one Spirit unto the Father." If all things be of the Father, all things are by the Son, and our communion or enjoyment of all things is in or through the Holy Spirit.

But, we are told, Christ prayed to the Father only, and so did his disciples.—And to whom should he have prayed? On earth he acted as man, as the messenger of the Father, and all his business was to do the Will of the Father.—The Apostles and first Christians very generally address the Father: but it is no less evident, That Paul makes his *calling on the name of Jesus Christ our Lord*, the distinguishing characteristic of Christians, 1 Cor. i. 2. "To all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ," &c. Again, Rom. x. 13. "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord, shall be saved." Of this we have several instances in Paul's Epistles, as 2 Tim. i. 16. "The Lord give mercy to the house of Onesiphorus," &c. What then, shall become of the proud, the Luciferian Unitarian, who disdains to bow to Jesus; or to call upon his Name? Can such a character

character deserve the name christian? Paul knew no such christians.

Again we are told---“ Their doxologies, as they are called, or forms of giving praise and glory to God, point out equally the same object of worship, the God of our Lord Jesus Christ.” Would your bigotry suffer you to understand the plainest language in scripture, you would see your mistake. Rev. i. 5. “ Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, &c.” c. v. 13. “ Blessing, honour and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth on the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever.” c. vii. 10. “ Salvation to our God who sitteth on the throne, and unto the Lamb.” i. Pet. iv. 11. “ Jesus Christ, to whom be praise and dominion for ever and ever.”--I add, The *Benedictions* of the Apostles are sometimes in the name of Father, Son and Spirit, (2 Cor. xiii. 14. Rev. i. 3, 4, 5.) but more frequently in the name of Christ alone. Certainly, too, the four living creatures, and the four and twenty elders viewed the Lamb as an object of worship, when they “ fell down before the Lamb and sung a new song” to him. Rev. v. 6. 9. 10. And to add no more on so clear a point, “ Singing hymns to Christ as to God” was the badge whereby Christians were known among the heathen, in the days of Pliny.

Upon

Upon the whole, the Socinian zeal against idolatry seems to be exceedingly partial and preposterous. All its shafts are directed against paying divine honours to the Son and Spirit of the living God, while it treats every species of *real* Idolatry with very much lenity. There is a reason for this. No class of mankind is more chargeable with Idolatry, in its vilest and most criminal form, than these disciples of Dr Priestly, the modern Socinus. Whatever the Dr pleases to dictate in religion, becomes a law to his disciples, is received by them with the most implicit submission, and propagated with the most ardent, yea frantic enthusiasm. This is only changing Popes—the man of Rome, for the man of Birmingham. Still it is “wondering after the beast;” as it would be easy to prove, that the religious system of the one has as little to do with common sense, true philosophy or christianity as the system of the other.

Moreover, Paul tells us, That “Covetousness,” or the love of a present world, “is Idolatry;” and speaks of men “whose god is their belly.” Here are two idols, the World and the Belly; and two kinds of Idolatry, Sensuality and “minding earthly things.” These idols are the objects of most general adoration; and this Idolatry the most damnable: yet against such things there is

no Unitarian law, or at least very little zeal. The reason is obvious—Such a law would condemn themselves. Provided he vehemently oppose the divinity of the Son of God, a man will be esteemed a worthy disciple of that faith, although he should constantly worship at the shrine of luxury, covetousness, pride and ambition.

Thus I have examined Mr Friend's Writings with attention: and this only have I found in them, That a man may be very zealous and very ignorant; that bigotry may disgrace an University-Education; and a man may be ignorant of the true character of Jesus even in *Jesus-College, Cambridge*.

PART II.

REMARKS *On T. F. Palmer's late Publication, entitled, An Attempt to refute a Sermon by H. D. Inglis, on the Godhead of Jesus Christ, and to restore the long lost Truth of the first Commandment.*

SEVENTEEN hundred years ago some people compassed sea and land to gain proselytes to what, they called, the true religion; nor is this ardour abated in the least at this present moment. Germany and Britain have

have been long famous for producing Reformers. In the 16th century many were justly famed, in these countries, for their zeal in the *Reformation from Popery*: and now Bahrdt, Steinbart, &c. in Germany, and Priestly with his coadjutors in England, are no less zealous in promoting a *Reformation from Protestantism*; being fully persuaded that

—— Religion was intended

For nothing else but to be mended.

Of late, too, we Scots have got a visit from a disciple of this new religion; and, to say the truth, he is not a whit behind its chiefest apostles, so far as zeal can go. He wants one thing, however; Satan has not yet taught him to “transform himself into an angel of light.” A star no doubt he is—but “some stars,” says a witty author, “only ray out darkness;” and this unluckily is but a too just description of our Reformer. Add to this, In his descent from heaven, he seems to have touched the moon in his course, by which accident he has received so much of the Lunar inspiration, as justly intitles his writings to the epithet *Luna-tarian*, rather than *Unitarian*.

He has done one thing, howbeit, clever enough. In his title-page prefixed to his late publication, against a Sermon by H. D. Inglis on the divinity of Christ, he boasts of restoring to us “the long lost truth of the

first Commandment.” Where he has discovered this Jewel, he has not told us. One of the ancients said “ Truth lies at the bottom of a well ;” and perhaps this diver found it, when he was *plunged* in the water.

The truth is, It is easy to find what is not lost. How T. F. Palmer can say That this truth has been lost, seems more than strange; while he himself acknowledges, that his brethren the Jews and Mahometans have retained it, even in Unitarian purity,—the Jews, since the second, the Mahometans since the sixth century of Christianity. This very command, too, is in the Christian Scriptures; yea, even in the creed of every Christian Sect. The Papists, indeed, have held this truth in impurity and unrighteousness, worshipping the creature more than the Creator; yet still they have held it. Though the second commandment has no place in their creed, the first has still that honour.

If it be said, It has been lost in practice. This may be true with respect to too many Christians: but why this zeal against a breach of the two first Commandments, while the other eight are still more lost, or disregarded in practice? Is not the observation of the whole enjoined by the same authority? And is not profane swearing, yea perjury, too common? Yet the Unitarians seem to think, if the being of one God be admitted, blaspheming

pheming his name is but a small matter. Are not Sabbath-breaking, disrespect to parental authority, murder, lasciviousness, theft, slander, covetousness—all too general? Why no zeal against these vices? A zeal so partial betrays the spirit of party, but not of a christian. When this author publishes again, I hope he will *attempt to restore* some other “lost Commandments.” At least he may be expected to recommend attention to the seventh Commandment, as this law enjoins *Unitarianism* as well as the first. Idolatry and adultery are nearly allied. He who said to us all “Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him *only* shalt thou serve,” has also said to the men, and chiefly to bishops, “Let every man have his own wife;” and to the woman, “Let every wife have her own husband,” and him *only* shall she serve. *Unitarian* wives will be universally acceptable.

So much for the title-page—But in the preface he makes a discovery, of a truth *truly* Unitarian;—a truth—if it may be so called,—that has been so “long lost,” that, since the world began, it has never entered into the heart of man or angel to conceive. And what is it, pray? Why, he has discovered the “two Witnesses,” mentioned with so much honour in the 11th of the Revelation. This mystery, which has been long the object of much investigation, and the

true sense of which has not been hitherto indisputably ascertained, is now laid fully open, and that by *bold assertion* alone, without even the pretence of *reason*! What can be mysterious to an Unitarian, who even knows perfectly how God exists?—A blind mare sees no difficulties in her way.

But who are these two witnesses? Why, Reader, let the author reveal the secret——

“ We Unitarian Christians, as also Jehovah’s ancient and modern Witnesses, the Jews, have long been giving our testimony in sackcloth; we both have long suffered all that intolerant establishments could inflict; but times are now fast altering, and we already, to use the language of the prophecy, stand upon our feet.” Such are the two Witnesses——

such their sufferings, and such their triumphs! They stand on their feet; but the prophecy adds (v. 12.) “ And they ascended up to heaven in a cloud, and their enemies beheld them.” When the Unitarians and Jews expect the fulfilment of this part of the prophecy, we are not told; but they may be assured that as soon as their enemies behold them ascending, they will become so far friends, as to wish them all a good journey.

——I am afraid this prediction has never yet been verified in fact, unless some of these Witnesses have gone up in a baloon, which, by the bye, seems to be the only vehicle, in
which

which some of them have any chance of ascending to heaven ; at least while they continue enemies to the gospel.

Several parties, in this very age, have appeared, claiming an exclusive right to the character of *the Lord's Witnesses*, whose pretensions are not generally allowed to be valid. Let us now examine the claim of these two new pretenders, that we may see whether its validity can be substantiated by evidence. And as the Unitarians consider reason as the test of truth, and aver That what reason cannot comprehend must be false, we shall try their pretensions by this standard.

Every witness must have a testimony. The two witnesses in the Revelation are said to overcome " by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony---to keep the commandments of God, and to have the testimony of Jesus Christ." This is called the record or testimony of God " that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in the Son. He that hath the Son hath life ; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." Now is this the testimony of the Jews either ancient or modern ? The ancient Jews crucified the Son of God, because he claimed this character, and the modern allow the deeds of their fathers. Both call God a liar to his face ; for says John, " He that believeth not God, hath made him a liar,

liar, because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son." 1 Ep. v. 10. Thus instead of bearing witness to the testimony of the "one true God," they directly call him a liar: and so far are they from keeping the commands of God, that they treat with contempt his chief commandment—That men "should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ"—the command given by Moses—"Him shall ye hear in all things, whatsoever he shall say to you." The testimony, then, of these Jews is, That God is a liar, when he says that Jesus of Nazareth is his own Son, his only begotten Son, in whom alone we have life: and the world is truly obliged to Mr Palmer for telling us so honestly, That the Unitarians agree in testimony with these Jews. But how witnesses against God can be called the Lord's witnesses, or witnesses for God, is a mystery so far above, yea so contrary to reason, that even a Swedenberg would not venture to impose it on the credulity of mankind. Only an Unitarian faith can swallow it.

It is true, indeed, the testimony of these witnesses, like that of their brethren (Mark xiv. 56, 58, 59.) does not in every respect "agree together." The Unitarians say—Jesus of Nazareth was "*a man approved of God*"—The Jews, that he was hated of God and an impostor. Yet they agree in the
the

the main; as both deny that he was the proper, the only-begotten Son of God; or that he was a Son of God in any other respect than any other Jew was. The Jews crucified Jesus, because he called God his Father, thereby making himself "equal with God." This they called blasphemy. The Unitarians say Amen; and call all who adhere to this testimony of Jesus concerning himself blasphemers and idolaters.

Brethren as these witnesses are, however, they cannot be induced "to dwell in unity." The Jews, who are honest and uniform in their testimony, abhor every idea of association with our Unitarians, whom they charge with the most vile dissimulation, hypocrisy and inconsistency—like Judas their ancestor, betraying the Son of Man with a kiss. Whoever wishes for a full proof of this fact, may read *David Levi's* Letters to Dr Priestly; in which he will find a Jew, a professed unbeliever in Christ, understanding the testimony of Christ, better than our divine of many titles, and treating the idea of a coalescence with the Dr with the utmost contempt and indignation.

The principal objections of the Jews against our Saviour were—He being a man only, as they supposed, made himself God; and his Apostles preached the remission of sins thro' his blood, as the sole atonement for sin.

Now

Now it deserves notice, that these two leading articles of the christian faith are equally odious to the Unitarians. Conscious that on these two pillars the whole fabric of christianity depends, the Unitarian chief, blind like Sampson, and strong in the energy of deceit, has exerted every effort to pull them down. Inconsiderate man! he does not see that he himself must perish in the ruins.—

So justly does Mr Palmer say—"We Unitarian christians and our brethren the Jews." Their principles are the same; and I add,

They are brethren in punishment. The Jews are blinded—"the veil is upon their heart in reading the Old Testament." In reading both testaments, this is the case of the Unitarians. Both say they see; but the light that is in them is darkness. Hence the clearest light of reason and argument can have no effect on minds, bewildered in their own reasonings, and having their foolish hearts darkened. The Jews as a people, never were made converts to a religion by reasoning. "Seeing is believing," has been their ruling maxim. God has shut them up in unbelief, that they through our mercy may obtain mercy: but the veil will never be taken off their hearts, till their eyes are turned to the Lord appearing in the clouds of heaven. When they look upon him, whom they have pierced, then they shall

shall mourn for him. Had Dr Priestly thought on this, his Letters to David Levi would never have been written—They *literally* contain the foolishness of preaching, as I dare say not a single Jew will become a profelyte to his reasoning. Had William Christie of Montrose, too, adverted to this, it would have saved him many a solemn, dull remark, made towards the end of his Discourses on the divine unity. Is it possible that a rational being can believe, That christians, giving up with the doctrine of the Divinity of Jesus would conciliate the affections of the Jews to christianity? Whether you call him God or man, the Jews never will believe in him, while they consider him as an impostor and a deceiver of the people: nor will they ever abandon this idea by all the reasoning of the world, whether Unitarian or Trinitarian. In darkness they will walk on, till “the Redeemer shall come to Zion to turn away ungodliness from Jacob. Shew us the sign from heaven,” said the Jews to Jesus, “and we shall believe in thee:” and as soon as this sign is displayed, they will keep their word.

But, says Mr Palmer, the bond of union between us and the Jews consists only in believing in, and worshipping the one true God, the Father of us all.—Let us, then, see what God the unbelieving Jews worshipped

ped in our Lord's time ; that we may know who is this God, whom the modern Jews and our Unitarians adore. Our Saviour determines this point in his reasonings with the Jews, John, viii. 38—55. " I speak that which I have seen with my Father : and ye do that which ye have seen with your Father. They said, We have one Father even God. Jesus answered, If God were your Father, ye would love me—— Ye are of *your Father the Devil*--ye say of my Father that he is your God ; yet you have *not known* him, and so are liars." What God, then, do the Jews worship ? We have Christ's authority to say---Not the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, for they are liars when they say so, as they have not known, *i, e,* believed in, loved or obeyed him. So far as they knew him, they hated him—— " Ye have hated both me and my Father," and so could not worship him. By the same authority we can say---The Devil is their Father, whose works they do : and if our Unitarians boast of a connexion with them in this respect, no christian will envy them of this honour.

Again, If the divine unity be the point of testimony in which Mr Palmer's two Witnesses agree, why had he not the honesty to tell us, That there are other two Witnesses, who agree exactly in the same point ? That
there

there is but one God is the chief article in the creed of *Deists* and *Mahometans*, no less than in that of the Jews and Unitarians. Thus we have got *four* witnesses ; and it must be confessed they are sprung from one Father, whom they believe in firmly, and worship devoutly.—Let us now compare their creeds together, that we may see wherein they agree.

The *Jew* says—There is one God, and Moses is his prophet.

The *Mahometan*—There is one God, and Mahomet is his prophet.

The *Unitarian*—There is one God, and Jesus is his prophet.

The *Deist*——There is one God, and Nature is his prophet.

In the first point, There is one God, all agree : in the second all differ. Yet it must be observed, that the difference between two of them is very trifling. The Jew and the Deist, indeed, will not allow that Jesus Christ was a prophet of God in any respect ; but the disciple of Mahomet admits that Jesus was not only divinely inspired, but that he was endued with a larger measure of the holy Spirit, than any preceding prophet, and that all that is written in the Scriptures concerning him is true. Thus far the Mahometan agrees with the Unitarian ; and it would be easy to prove, that the former has

D

a more

a more perfect faith in the character of Jesus Christ, than the latter. It is true, the Mahometan considers Mahomet as the last and greatest of the prophets, so whatever Jesus has said, it must not be explained so as to contradict Mahomet, as he has declared the whole counsel of God to man. Herein, however, he is only more honest than our Unitarian, who says Jesus is the prophet, and yet will not receive any part of his testimony, but in the sense Priestly is pleased to put upon it—a sense the most unnatural, forced and absurd, that ever has been put on any writings in the world. The real creed of the Unitarian, then, is—There is one God, and Priestly is his prophet; and it is a matter of moonshine to a Christian, whether Priestly or Mahomet be exalted to that honour. Both have equally “stood in the counsel of God.”——The Mahometan, then, is the full brother of the Unitarian, as he admits that Jesus was a prophet of God, which neither the Jew nor the Deist will allow.

But Mr Palmer quotes a passage in Isaiah, where the Jews are called God’s Witnesses, “Ye are my Witnesses,” saith Jehovah, “that I am God.”——Sometimes, indeed, the ancient Jews gave a direct testimony to this truth; but did they not often turn aside to worship other Gods? And after Christ came, we are assured that none of them are
 God’s

God's Witnesses, save the disciples who believed in Christ. Of these he says, "Ye shall bear witness." *Joat* v. 27. "Ye shall be Witnesses unto me—unto the uttermost part of the earth." *Acts* i. 8. These were true Witnesses for God, as they "set to their seal, that God is true." But how the modern Jews, who receive not the testimony of God concerning his Son, can be called his Witnesses, while they set to their seal, That God is a liar, only an Unitarian genius can possibly understand.

There is one respect, indeed, in which the Jews and Unitarians are Witnesses of the truth of God in the Scriptures. It was foretold by the Prophets, That when the Messiah should come to his own land, his own people would not receive him, but crucify him as an Impostor; for which cause God would scatter them over all the earth, and make them a hissing and a reproach among all people. Of this truth they are witnesses. In like manner, the Apostles have foretold, That in the last days teachers would come—"proud, knowing nothing, but roving about questions and strifes of words—resisting the truth—of no judgment concerning the faith—yea denying the Lord that bought them," or that the Lord bought them with his blood: and charity herself must allow, that this is the exact character of the Unitarians.

So much for the preface—If the Reader pleases to look into the work itself, he will find some truths ^{tr} greater than these—he will see, That one by prejudice may be “so blind to perception, so deaf to reason, so lame in intellect as not to see” the plainest, the most obvious truths in the Scriptures—That Solomon’s fool is still alive, who while he is by the way, his wisdom fails him, and he tells to every one that he is a fool—the beginning of whose words is foolishness, and the end of his talk mischievous madness. In short, he will find comments on Scripture, so void of reason, so opposite to common sense, and yet so bold in assertion, that he must apply to them the motto of Solomon—“Vanity of Vanities, all is vanity.”

This author first undertakes to prove, what no man in the use of his reason, ever will attempt to prove,—That no name, property or work, whereby the true God is distinguished from his creatures, is any where in Scripture applied to Jesus Christ. It is true, the Word or Son of God is only called Jesus Christ, with respect to that body of flesh or human nature, in which he tabernacled while among us: but that he who thus dwelt among us, complexly taken, claims to himself Omniscience, Omnipotence, a power to do all that the Father does, Life in himself and a power to quicken whom he pleases; and that he is called, Jehovah, God,

God, God with us, Creator and Preserver of all things, &c. is so conspicuously evident in the sacred Oracles, that it would be the veriest trifling to point out particular passages in proof of it, to a man disposed to call it in question. It would be as foolish an attempt to convince a man by reasoning, that the sun shines at noon-day. If you tell the truth to a child of the devil, he will not believe you: not because the truth wants evidence, but because the dark heart cannot receive it.—Let in light upon an owl, it only sets him a-screeching.

Mystery is the characteristic of the Unitarians. A man of plain sense reading what Jesus said to John's disciples "Go and tell John, what things you have seen and heard, how the *blind* see, the *lame* walk, the *deaf* hear, &c. would immediately conclude, that he meant that John would certainly know by these characters, that his master was the Messiah prophesied of by Isaiah, whose coming he distinguishes by these very marks, "The eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap as an hart, &c. And, indeed, if our Lord did not mean thus to point out himself as the Messiah, spoken of by the Prophets, it would puzzle an archangel to say for what purpose he bade John's disciples tell these things to their master, as

an answer to that question---“ Art thou he that should come, &c.”——But this is too plain and *literal* for an Unitarian. It must have a *mystic* sense. It means, says Mr Palmer, “ that no one shall be so blind to perception, so deaf to reason, so lame in intellect, as not to see, and gratefully acknowledge this great salvation, &c.”* In this mystic sense, the Prophet uses these terms, c. xlv. 18, 19. and therefore he must always use them in this sense! Is not this a *logical* conclusion?——In this *mystic* sense, however, these terms may well be applied to this author---“ Hear, ye *deaf*, and look, ye *blind*, that ye may see. Who is *blind* but” Dr Priestly’s servant, “ and deaf as the messenger that he has sent.”

Blind he must be, else he would have seen, that even supposing the prophecy, Is. xxxv. to refer to the return of the Jews “ from their present long captivity to their own land again,” many will be so far from seeing, and acknowledging this great salvation, that they will gather in multitudes to fight against the Jews, Ez. xxxviii. & xxxix. Zech. xiv. 1, 2, 14, 15.

But “ the cure of the blind and lame” were no “ proofs of the Godhead of Jesus.”† Be it so: but were they not proofs, that he was the personage of whom Isaiah spoke, when he says, “ Behold your God will come
with

with vengeance, even God with a recompence, he will come and save you." And how shall we know him when he comes? The prophet replies, "Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, &c." Does not this say, that these miracles would ascertain the Advent of the Great Personage he calls *God* and *your God*, in ver. 4.?

As to this writer's buffoonery concerning the Godhead of "Peter and Paul," it is below notice. It is false that Jesus wrought no miracle "by his own power." He had power to lay down his life, and power to take it again; and this was the greatest miracle he ever wrought. It is true, he could "do nothing of himself," or independent of and in opposition to the Father, as he was so in the Father, and the Father in him, that the Father and he were one. But it is no less true, that the Father can do, or at least does nothing without, or independent of the Son. "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work. What things soever he doeth these also doeth the Son likewise." This sure is "the language of the omnipotent." When did Moses, Peter or Paul claim any such powers?—It is false, too, that the Father "did miracles by the hands of Peter and Paul." They did all "in the name, or by the power of Jesus of Nazareth." Acts, iii. 6.

But,

But, he adds, “suppose you had proved, that the names of the Almighty were ascribed to him, it would be no sort of proof of the Godhead of Jesus?” If you ask him—Why? He tells you, you will find Jews named Abitub, *i. e.* Father of Goodness; Abiud, *i. e.* Father of Praise; Eliel, *i. e.* God my God; Elihu, *i. e.* my God himself. And from this he concludes, That supposing Jesus to bear “the names of the Supreme, it would be no more a proof of his Godhead, than that of all these Jews just mentioned.” One knows not whether to laugh or stare at such nonsense. “*Half-reasoning*” is a character applied to the elephant. This is more than can justly be said of some authors. Could Mr Palmer stop for a moment in his career of folly and impertinence, we might ask him, 1st, Where is the Almighty called Abiud, Abitub, Eliel, or Elihu? 2dly, Did God authorise the parents of these Jews to call them by these names; or did he call them so himself? If these were the names of the Almighty; if he claimed them as his peculiar property, and yet had assigned them to these same Jews, the conclusion would have been solid: but as the reverse is the truth, it goes for nothing, or only serves to display the ignorance and stupidity of the reasoner. This is more true of what he adds—“You might, with full

as much reason, say that because, in the time of Cromwell, there was a fanatic named Praise God Barebones, that this was a proof of this man's divinity."---An ass might blush at this saying. To praise God is the business of a creature. Is this the name of the Creator? or must we conclude, that he who praises God is God? There are some fanatics so weak, in the time of George III. as *to praise Palmer*; must we thence conclude, that they are Palmer himself?

The petulance of what follows can only be palliated by its ignorance! Had "you proved that Jesus is called Jehovah, you might have brought it as a proof at the same time, of the Godhead of the city of Jerusalem; because we read, Jer. xxxiii. 16. This is the name wherewith *she* shall be called --- Jehovah our righteousness."---So it reads indeed in our translation; but a small share of knowledge of the original would have taught him, that it should have been rendered---"This is the name, wherewith *she* shall call him---Jehovah our righteousness." This makes the text agree with the context and with common sense: but this Mr P. has either not learning to know, or honesty to confess.

But when a new translation of a text will serve the purpose of Unitarianism, he is very ready to give it. Witness his
version

version of Isa. ix. 6.---A version so absurd and senseless, that no rational, unbiassed reader can possibly admit it. But it is the production of his orthodox brethren, the modern Jews, and tends to depreciate the Son of God---therefore it must be right!

It would be vain to animadvert on what he says about "three Gods, God metamorphosed into a child---a baby dressed up in the prerogatives of the deity, &c. &c." This is the mere rant of a frantic enthusiast. No christian admits of three Gods, or of a God become a child. These are phantoms of Mr Palmer's fancy---Poor man! Let him divert himself with them. But little does he consider, that if God had not been in the womb of a woman, this writer never has blasphemed his Son. The Devil made him an Unitarian, but God made him a man. And where was he made? "Thou hast possessed my reins: thou hast covered me in my mother's womb." If this knowledge be too high for our reason to comprehend, it is unreasonable to believe, that God has taken part of our flesh and blood, and dwelt in the man Christ Jesus? So God has said, and although Mr P. should rage and blaspheme---He that sits in heaven shall laugh.

Mr Frend and he challenges us to point out a single passage in sacred writ, in which the divine names or perfections are ascribed

to Jesus Christ.---This would be a very idle
 talk. To point out the sun to one that sees,
 would be needless ; to point him out to the
 blind, foolish : and none are so blind as
 these who will not see. Blinded by a par-
 tiality to England, Dr Johnson travelled
 over Scotland, and could not see a single
 tree in the whole kingdom : blinded by a
 like spirit of bigotry, an Unitarian traverses
 the scriptures, and cannot, or will not, see
 the most obvious truth in the whole---a
 truth to be found every where from the
 beginning of Genesis to the end of the Re-
 velation.---The God, who made the world,
 spoke to and was seen by Adam ; he ap-
 peared to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob ; he
 dwelt between the Cherubim ; Moses and
 the Elders of Israel saw God, and all Is-
 rael heard his voice out of the fire. Was
 this the invisible God, whom no man hath
 seen or can see at any time ? Who was it
 then ? John tells us " The only begotten
 Son, in the bosom of the father, hath de-
 clared or manifested him" in all ages. Thus
 God, invisible in his abstract nature, hath
 been always visible in his Son, else mankind
 never could have known any thing of him ;
 no man knows the Father but the Son, and
 to whom the Son shall reveal him. This
 image of the invisible God, in whom all the
 fullness of God dwelt, was the God of the
 Jews

Jews--the God who speaks in all these passages, so largely and so ignorantly quoted by Mr P. from the 58th page of his book to the end--the God, who says "There is no God else beside me--before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be any after me." Well could he say so; seeing all that can in truth be called God dwelt in the visible character, so that he who saw the Son, saw the Father also.

Who, then, is guilty of breaking the first Commandment? The Socinian--the man, who refuses to see and worship the Father in his Son, and so dwelling in and connected with him, that the Father and he are one--who worship some imaginary invisible Being, totally unconnected with any visible character, a God out of Christ, in whose bosom "the only-begotten" never lay---This is to worship a God beside him, who was seen and heard by the ancient Jews. Let Mr P. then take the advice he so readily gives to others--"For your own safety, remember That no idolaters shall inherit the kingdom of God, but shall have their part in the lake, which burneth with fire and brimstone." *

How blind, too, must that man be, who talks so much of the knowledge the ancient Jews had of the true God; while he at the same

same time believes that his Son Jesus had no existence before the reign of Cæsar Augustus! This very Jesus assures us, That no man knows the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son reveals him. *Query*, How then could the ancient Jews know the Father, some thousand years before this Son was born? Could he reveal the Father when he himself had no existence? or could any man know the Father otherwise?

How ignorant, or how dishonest must that man be, who can say that Christ was "ignorant of the day of Judgment, and could not give away two places in his kingdom!" Is it possible, that he, who was in the bosom of the Father, and was privy to all his counsels, could he be ignorant of so trifling a circumstance? He must be unskilful in the Greek, indeed, who does not know, that the verb signifying *to know*, frequently signifies *to make known*. "I determined" says Paul "to know nothing, *i. e. to make nothing known* among you, but Jesus Christ, &c." In the same manner, our Lord tells us, that even he "the Son himself could not make known," or disclose the day or hour of the judgment: it was not his office or any part of his business on earth to reveal this secret. Does this say he was ignorant of it? When he says too, to Zebedee's sons "to sit on my right hand and on my left in my kingdom

E

is

is not mine to give," he evidently means it does not belong to my office at present—it is not my business on earth. According to the plan of wisdom, he must first officiate as a prophet; then as a priest; and lastly as a king. As yet he had not obtained the kingdom, and hence could not with propriety assign distinguished places or stations in it to any. But that he had such power, and could exercise it when consistent with the designs of Wisdom, is certain; for when he sat down on the throne he says "To him that overcomes, will *I give to sit* with me on my throne."—This was surely his to give—and this was the highest honour in the kingdom.

Arguments like these conclude equally against the divinity of the Father and the Son. As T. F. Palmer has so long and so wantonly vilified the character of the Son of God, perhaps he may think it proper to ask the Father that he may judge him, without or independent of the Son, at the last day. In this case, he may be assured, was an answer to be given, it would be—*It is not mine to give—to grant your request*—"I have committed all judgment to the Son."—Must we conclude from this that the Father is not omnipotent, because he *cannot* act inconsistent with his purposes, or because it is *impossible* for God to lie?

But

But of all the comments that ever a sacred text suffered, perhaps these of this author on John xx. 28. viii. 58. are the most *outré*, unnatural and strained. To a man of common sense the first text needs no comment. Thomas, by an unreasonable obstinacy, refused to credit the testimony of his brethren, who assured him that the Lord was risen, of which they were eye-witnesses. He must see before he believe. Nor was this evidence withheld; for eight days after, while he and the other disciples were assembled, Jesus entering said, "Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing." Upon this Thomas having assured himself of the truth, that this was no phantom, but the real person of his Lord, in extacy of joy, cries out "My Lord and my God." That his master understood this, as a profession of his faith in the reality of the resurrection, is certain from his answer—"Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed."—Here is no obscurity. No unbiaſſed mind, however weak can possibly mistake its meaning. But it favours the divinity of our Saviour, therefore it must be wrested by the Unitarians, as they do other Scriptures, to their own destruction.

“ While the disciples were met,” says T. F. Palmer, “ suddenly the bolted doors burst open, and Jesus came in the midst ! Thomas, affrighted and terrified, like all the rest, thinking he saw his ghost, cried out with amazement and terror, ‘ My Lord and my God ! ’ It was the ejaculation of fear ; it was the cry of terror ; it was a half-formed prayer to the almighty, which amazement choked the utterance of.”——Bold assertions, Sir, but where is the argument. I can assert as boldly, and with more truth, This rhapsody of your’s is the ejaculation of nonsense ; the cry of frenzy ; a full-formed absurdity, which common sense would have choked the utterance of.—Does the text say that “ the doors burst open ; ” or that Thomas was “ affrighted and terrified ? ” The cry of terror is instantaneous. But Thomas said nothing, when his Lord appeared, till after he had heard him say “ Peace be to you—Reach hither thy finger, &c.” Was this terrible ? Could the words of love and reason inspire terror ? The terror, the amazement, the ghost, are all creatures of your distempered brain.

Again, if the words of Thomas be a “ prayer to the almighty,” Jesus is that almighty ; for the text expressly says, Thomas *said to him* “ My Lord and my God.” But what decides the point is—It will be allowed

ed that his master understood Thomas; and he explains what he said, not as "the cry of terror," but as an expression of faith—"Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed." Such is the sense of this exclamation given by our Lord, who not only knew the words but the hearts of men; and whether we shall believe him or T. F. Palmer, only an Unitarian can be at a loss to determine.

"Terrified, *like all the rest.*"—mentiris impudentissime! The rest saw him the week before; and were glad, when "they saw the Lord." What was terrific in his appearance now? Did he not enter, speaking the words of peace?—Poor man! may Jesus give thee repentance, else terrible will he appear to thee, when he comes in flames of fire!

Your "plain questions" can be easily answered. You ask "Can you think it in nature, that from a firm persuasion that Jesus was a dead corpse, Thomas should run into an opinion so opposite, as that he was the everlasting God, who could not die?" If your friends had heard of your death, would they not instantly run into the opposite opinion, when they see you alive? It is false that Thomas had a firm persuasion that his Lord was not risen: he only doubted. Nor could he be a christian, unless he believed that his master was "the mighty God, Emmanuel,

manuel, God with us ; our God, in whom dwells all the fullness of the Godhead.

Again, " Could Thomas believe Jesus to be the invisible God of the Jews, for this reason, because he was now visible before his eyes ? " Yes ; The God of the Jews was visible—they saw him, they heard him, he dwelt among them. The spirit of a man is in its essence invisible ; but it makes it's existence and powers visible in the flesh. The same is true of God. Invisible in his abstract nature, he has manifested his existence and perfections in his Son, who from the beginning has been, and still is " the image, the visible character of the invisible God." And must not he be God, in whom the fullness of Godhead dwells ? And must not Thomas be justified in calling him " My God," when he saw him possessed of a power to raise himself from the dead ? Is not this the power of God ?—As to your " immaterial, untangible spirit of the universe ; " Is Dr Priestly's *material* spirit, immaterial and untangible ? " These things, Sir, are impossible."

A very small share of common prudence would have prevented you from exposing yourself to the ridicule of mankind, by your explication of John-viii. 58. In answer to the question the Jews proposed " Hast thou seen Abraham," our Lord replied " Before Abra-
ham

ham was, I am." This answer is so determinate; it so expressly asserts his pre-existence and claim to the Messiah-ship, that the Jews themselves, not so "perverse as yourself," did not misunderstand it. This excited their rage, as it does that of their Unitarian brethren: but they had not the effrontery to explain away his meaning as you do. "No;" you say, "he never said he had seen Abraham; but merely this, 'that before Abraham was, I am *He*,' the promised one: I am that person, who existed in the decrees of God, before Abraham was." *—To what mean shifts does a false hypothesis reduce you! To support a lie, the wisdom of God must speak impertinently—must speak nonsense! Every man, every event, "existed in the decrees of God, before Abraham was." If this be all our Lord intended; if he could expose his life to the most imminent danger by a mere quibble, a play on words, totally incompatible with every idea of integrity or prudence,—he justly merited the treatment he got from the Jews. If T. F. Palmer was on trial for life, and was asked Hast thou seen Abraham? Would he reply "Before Abraham was, I am?" Would he not use terms the most unequivocal?—I add, supposing the Jews to have understood this answer in the above sense, still their rage would have been

* Page 26.

been justly kindled by such trifling and evasive conduct.

To combat the idea, that Jesus here claims the character of "the great *I AM* in Exodus," you tell us, That *HE* ought to be added to *I am*; and then it will read "I am He," *i. e.* "the Messiah, the Light of the world." Let this be granted; little do you see where it will lead you---The God, who bade Moses say to Israel "*I am* hath sent me unto you," was not invisible---he appeared, he spake to Moses. Who, then, was this, but the "express image of the Father," in whom alone he has made himself known in all ages---the very personage, who now in our flesh says to the Jews "I am He"---I am the great personage, whom your fathers knew by the epithet *I am*.

For the honour of human nature, I would gladly cover what follows with a veil. "This expression will prove also the divinity of the blind beggar in the next chapter: For, in John, ix. 9. the Apostle applies the name of the great *I am* to this blind Jew." A lie! The Apostle only tells what his master and the blind man said of themselves. "Some said this is He, others said he is like him; but he said *I am* He." And who does not see the propriety of this saying? It is asked, Is this the man, who was blind and now sees? To this he replies---*I am*. Here was no shuffle.

shuffle. But had it been asked—Hast thou seen Abraham? Would the beggar have said—*I am*? Or if he had said so, what would mankind have thought?—From the above remark, one might justly ask T. F. Palmer ---Art thou a fool? And if he answered justly, he would certainly give the blind beggar's reply.

It is added, "Both, our Lord and the blind beggar, use the very same phrase, and, I make no doubt, in the very same sense."* Now, Sir, by your own interpretation, our Lord meant to say *I am the Messiah*. Did the blind beggar too claim this character?—Again, you tell us, that Jesus meant to say—"I am that person who existed in the decrees of God, before Abraham was." Now as you say both use the *I am*, in the same sense;" the beggar must have meant also to say, "I am He, who existed in the decrees of God before Abraham was!!" There is a commentary for you, reader! if you can swallow this *camel*, transubstantiation will be but a *gnat*.

"The *blind beggar*"---Would to God his commentator *saw* as well! The beggar believed in Jesus, and worshipped him as the Son of God; his commentator pretends to believe in him, and treats him with indignity! He refuses him even the "eastern reverence

* Page 27.

verence---a slavish bow." The Jews and he are brethren---both cry is not this the carpenter's son?" Nor will either of them, I am afraid, change their mind, till the day come, when to Jesus "every knee shall bow" and "every tongue confess that he is Lord."

Such as read Mess. William Christie and Palmer's works, must observe a wide difference between their comments on these two texts above quoted. They differ, too, in their general manner. The former reasons, the latter asserts; the one speaks calmly---the other roars; Christie attempts conviction, by a shew of argument, and has little success; Palmer cries, D---I take you, and makes more proselytes.

Upon the whole, if there be no names or titles in scripture by which the Creator is distinguished from his creatures, it must be impossible to know when the one or the other speaks or acts. Is the Creator called Jehovah; this Palmer tell us, the city of Jerusalem has the same name. Is he called *El* or God; this writer finds many Jews, of whose names *El* makes a part, from whence he *sagely* concludes, that they too must be divine beings. Again, when we hear one saying to Moses, *I am that I am*, we are told that the blind beggar in John ix. is called by the same epithet! Thus we have got fairly rid of a God altogether. Though Jesus should
claim

claim these titles, this, we are told, will not prove him to be the divine Being: consequently, though the Father should claim the same epithets, neither will this prove him to be the true God. So inconsiderate is this author! "The fool has said in his" argument "There is no God."*

The same may be applied to his Sophisms on "the properties and perfections peculiar to God, being applied to Christ." Sect. II. They equally tend to dishonour the Father and

* Nor is his conduct more consistent than his principles; as appears from the following instance. Intending of late to preach at Newburgh, and to eat with his disciples there, a feast, not in memory of Christ's death, as a sacrifice for sin, but to confirm brotherly love,—he recollected that the preacher in that society had not been baptized according to the Institutions of Palmerian wisdom. Baptized, indeed, he had been "into the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit." But this was doing a thing according to Christ's appointment; and consequently to an Unitarian could be of no avail. What then shall be done? Why, an Epistle is sent before, intimating that he could not eat with the preacher till he was re-baptized—For what avails it, says he, to be baptized into the Name "of three Gods! mere Paganism?"—Who could resist the force of so *weighty* an argument?—He comes; and the preacher is dipped in the Water of Tay *in the Name of Jesus Christ!*—Yet, so consistent is this scrupulous Saint, he eateth at the same time with other two, who had been only baptized into what he calls mere Paganism!—Two Christians and two Pagans—a curious club.

That our Lord ordered us to be baptized in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit is certain. These, says Mr P. are three Gods! The consequence is obvious—Christ acknowledged three Gods, and commanded us to be initiated into mere Paganism!!—I dare say, Reader, if you had viewed these words of your Saviour in this light, you never would consent to be baptized into his name.

and the Son. Thus for instance, 1st, It is argued, That Christ is eternal, from John, i. 1. "In the beginning was the Word, &c." But, says Mr P. "I did not know that eternity had a beginning. If he was eternal, how was he begotten; did he beget himself? or did another beget him into being when he was in being?"—In the same manner, an Atheist would argue against the eternity of the Father—He is eternal, you say, and, as a proof, you quote Gen. i. 1. where mention is made of a beginning. I did not know that eternity had a beginning. If he was eternal, how was he formed? Did he make himself; or did another beget him into being, when he was in being? 2dly, "He is Almighty." But does not Paul say—"I can do all things?" 3dly, "He is omniscient." Then all christians must be Gods as well as the Father; for John says "ye know all things."* 4thly, "He is omnipresent." But "Paul when a hundred miles distant was present in spirit with the Corinthians." 1 Ep. v. 3, 4. Ergo, "Paul was omnipresent;" for who does not see, that 100 miles include the whole Universe? Again,

"You go on to prove, from the properties of holiness and justice, that the Father is God; and, by the same argument, you might prove, that Noah, Daniel and Job, &c.

* Page 30.

&c. were self-existent Gods; for they all had the properties, holiness and justice." Besides,

You aver that God the Father of all is good; and say "There is none good but one, that is God." Yet in the next page (33) you tell us of one Mr Tyrwhit who is both "great and good;" consequently, he is God too!

Well said, Atheist! Thou hast turned Mr P.'s arguments against himself; and it must be owned they are of equal force on your side to disprove the divinity of the Father, as on his, to combat the idea of the Godhead of the Son.---Convenient arguments, indeed! They prove every thing, and therefore can prove nothing, except the folly and insolence of the reasoner.

But let us hear the Atheist to Amen—Mr P. says the Father must be God, because divine works are ascribed to him, as raising the dead, judging the world, &c. Now,

"If raising the dead proves him to be God, it proves also Elijah, Elisha, Peter and Paul, all to have been Gods; for they also raised the dead.*

"If judging the world proves the Father to be God, it proves you to be one; for know you not, St Palmer, that the saints are to judge the world?"†

F

I hope

* Page 34.

† Page 35.

I hope, now, the reader will excuse me for passing over this *Section* in silence. The Atheist has evidently proven, That all its pretended arguments tend to Atheism, or to prove, that there is no God: and I can tell thee, reader, if thou canst be led away from the faith by so blind a guide, thou art blind indeed. Such snares may catch moles; those, who have eyes will not be caught by them.

Nor need I detain my reader long, in examining the 3d *Section*,

On divine Worship paid Jesus Christ.

In this department we find nothing new. It only contains the rant of Brother Frend repeated—the cry of the party—the ravings of a delirious enthusiasm.

Unitarianism is the Quixotism of the day—a religious Knight-errantry---Its Knights are of the Quixotical order*. Mounted on their Hobby in quest of adventures,---not to knock down giants but false gods--not to demolish enchanted castles but enchanted churches;—they see, or think they see these hideous monsters wherever they

* It may, perhaps, be justly considered as a kind of religious knight-errantry, for the leader of any particular sect to attack all others, with a confident expectation of bringing them over to his own persuasion. Possibly, time may shew that the attempts which Dr Priestly has of late been making to convert to Unitarianism, not only Episcopalians and Independents, but Methodists, Jews and Swedenborgians are of this kind.—MONTHLY REVIEW for April, 1792.

they come. Ardent in zeal, and bold in the confidence of martial abilities, as soon as a false god appears, though terrible as the spirit of Loda, they instantly try their steel on him, like Ossian's hero of old. It is probable, however, they may mistake a wind-mill for a giant, and meet Don Quixote's fate. Every chieftan, who fights with gods, has not the arm, nor the success of Fingal.

Our hero, in his peregrinations through Scotland, finds false gods, it seems, and idolaters every where. Hence his perpetual cry—three gods, idolatry, blasphemy, hell, damnation! And some Sancho's are credulous enough to join him in the cry.—But what false God has he found? Why a God of flesh and blood, and so not a true God, who is a spirit. “When, Sir, you worship Jesus Christ, you do not worship that invisible God who is a spirit, but a different God, with a material body of flesh and bones, &c. Thus, Sir, you break the first and greatest of all commands, &c.”* What a phantom! Little does this visionary know, that none of us worship the flesh and bones of the man Christ Jesus; but we worship “God manifested in flesh—God in Christ reconciling the world to himself;” nor do we admit that the divine nature in Christ is numerically distinct from the divinity in general.

F 2

But

But we cannot honour or worship the Father without worshipping the Son, as in the Son the whole fullness of the Godhead dwells *bodily*. You may try then to worship God out of Christ; but as for us, after the way which you call heresy, we will worship the God of our fathers.

So strong is the truth, that even Socinians, the chief of the foes of God, must yield to it. They translate John i. 1. thus: "In the beginning was *Reason*, and *Reason* was with God, and God was that *Reason*." God and Reason, then, are the same. Now it is said, ver. 14. "Reason was made, or took flesh and dwelt among us,"—consequently God took flesh. If this be to "debase him by embodying him in a body of flesh and bones," and to make him "as much an idol as a crucifix,"* the charge is laid against God himself; and the Socinians would do well to take the advice of a brother Jew--- Not to fight against God.

To worship a God out of Christ is to worship a God unknown in the Scriptures. It is to worship Dr Priestly's monstrous idol—it is idolatry—a breach of "the first and greatest of all commands."

But, it seems, we are guilty too of a breach of the second command. How? "You break it, by worshipping a *similitude*,
a *likeness*."

a *likeness*. Moses said, Deut. iv. 15. 'Take heed—lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image—the likeness of a male.' But you have apostatized from him who has no similitude, and worship a real male, one who was *circumcised*, when he was *eight days old*." To one who can write such brutish things I need say nothing: Reason must address a man---a rod alone is for the fool's back. But I beg my reader's attention to what follows, 1st. T. F. Palmer says God has no similitude, image or likeness. This is true of the Unitarian God---but what says the true God? Gen. i. 26, 27. "Let us make man in *our image*, after *our likeness*---so God created man in his own image." Let the Unitarian, then, wear the image of the Devil, if he will---man is the image of God. Again, Jesus, the Son of God, "is the image of the invisible God---the express image of him." Christians, too, are predestinated to be conformed to *the image* of the Son, who is the express image of the invisible God.——So false is it that the true God has no similitude.

2dly. God has forbidden us "to make to ourselves a graven image, the likeness of a male." This is true: but has he hereby bound up himself from making any likeness of himself? The prohibition reaches only to us, **God has made likenesses of himself: he has**

But we cannot honour or worship the Father without worshipping the Son, as in the Son the whole fullness of the Godhead dwells *bodily*. You may try then to worship God out of Christ; but as for us, after the way which you call heresy, we will worship the God of our fathers.

So strong is the truth, that even Socinians, the chief of the foes of God, must yield to it. They translate John i. 1. thus: "In the beginning was *Reason*, and *Reason* was with God, and God was that *Reason*." God and Reason, then, are the same. Now it is said, ver. 14. "Reason was made, or took flesh and dwelt among us,"—consequently God took flesh. If this be to "debase him by embodying him in a body of flesh and bones," and to make him "as much an idol as a crucifix,"* the charge is laid against God himself; and the Socinians would do well to take the advice of a brother Jew---- Not to fight against God.

To worship a God out of Christ is to worship a God unknown in the Scriptures. It is to worship Dr Priestly's monstrous idol—it is idolatry—a breach of "the first and greatest of all commands."

But, it seems, we are guilty too of a breach of the second command. How? "You break it, by worshipping a *similitude*,
a *likeness*."

* Page 40.

a *likeness*. Moses said, Deut. iv. 15. "Take heed—lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image—the likeness of a male." But you have apostatized from him who has no similitude, and worship a real male, one who was *circumcised*, when he was *eight days old*." To one who can write such brutish things I need say nothing: Reason must address a man—a rod alone is for the fool's back. But I beg my reader's attention to what follows, 1st. T. F. Palmer says God has no similitude, image or likeness. This is true of the Unitarian God—but what says the true God? Gen. i. 26, 27. "Let us make man in *our image*, after *our likeness*—so God created man in his own image." Let the Unitarian, then, wear the image of the Devil, if he will—man is the image of God. Again, Jesus, the Son of God, "is the image of the invisible God—the express image of him." Christians, too, are predestinated to be conformed to *the image* of the Son, who is the express image of the invisible God.—So false is it that the true God has no similitude.

2dly. God has forbidden us "to make to ourselves a graven image, the likeness of a male." This is true: but has he hereby bound up himself from making any likeness of himself? The prohibition reaches only to us. God has made likenesses of himself: he has

exhibited to us his own Son---his most express image; and when he brought him into the world he said---“ Let all the angels of God worship him---and all men honour the Son as they honour the Father.” Did he bid us break the second command? Worshipping an image God has made, is not worshipping an image we have made to ourselves.

3dly. If worshipping Christ be forbidden in this command, he must be a graven image we have made, as this alone is prohibited in it. But this image of the invisible God existed in Paul’s day, and long before---and did the Trinitarians make him? They must be clever fellows indeed!

4thly. He says we “ break it, by worshipping a similitude,” and immediately gives himself the lie---“ You worship, not the likeness of a male, but a *real* male.”---Thus we stand acquitted, our accuser himself being judge.

5thly. It must be observed, that although God no where allows us to bow down to any figure or image made by human device, yet he no where prohibits us from paying that homage to a real man. There is a kind of respect, reverence and honour, expressed by external signs, which we owe to men, and which the Scripture exemplifies and even enjoins. This very author quotes a variety of examples; such as “ all the congregation

gregation worshipped the Lord and the king:" and does not Paul command us to "give honour to whom honour is due, and fear or rather veneration, esteem to whom esteem. This is called worship in Scripture. But the Unitarian, it seems, must pay no reverence, respect or homage to "a real man," for fear of breaking the second command—I hope he has not extended the prohibition to *real* women. We may still say "With my body *I thee* worship."

But what is this thing called *worship*, which is too sacred to be paid to the Son of God? It means "mere reverence, outward respect. It is nearly the Eastern reverence, a slavish bow!"* And this, if you believe mere assertion, is all that "Jairus, the leper, the disciples, did, when they fell down, and worshipped Jesus of Nazareth." This is all that is meant, it seems, by the word *worship* in our translation; and this very author admits that this worship was due to him as a prophet. If so, I dare say it will puzzle the reader to find idolatry in offering to any what is his due. Why all this noise about idolatry, breaking the commands, by worshipping Jesus, since worship in the full meaning of the term is but his due? Thus, Reader, you have even Unitarian authority for worshipping your Redeemer, by falling down,

* Page 43, 44.

down, reverence, respect and at least a slavish bow. Only take care it be all "outward," in deep hypocrisy. The Unitarian, like Satan, cannot love.

After all, I dare say it will not be easily admitted, that the sentiments of the heart were wholly uninterested in the acts of worship recorded in scripture. Can we believe, that when the "congregation of Israel worshipped the Lord and the king," that they felt no internal sentiments of reverence, love and joy; particularly when we are told, they "blessed Jehovah their God, and did eat and drink before him with *great gladness of heart*?" or when the disciples worshipped their ascending Lord, and "returned to Jerusalem with great joy," felt they nothing of admiration, esteem, love or joy? Gave they nothing but "a slavish bow?" Did David mean no more, when he said "I will worship toward thy holy place?"——Truly, Mr P. thy words may be well applied to thyself——"O! Sir, what a teacher in Israel, what a scripture-critic are you, not to know the meaning of the word worship," so plainly set before you in John, iv. 24. "God is a spirit; and they that worship him, *must worship in spirit and in truth*!" This is true worship---all without this is mere hypocrisy.

But Israel did not "say prayers to David!" a pert but ignorant remark. Every petition
is

is a prayer—And did Israel never ask any petitions of their king? Not only so---they sung praises to him too—"Saul has slain his thousands, and David his ten thousands."—The truth is, Israel asked of their king things proper for him to give—favours in his power to grant; and they asked of their God things proper for him to grant, the blessings he had promised. In asking David, they respected him as their king; in asking Jehovah, they revered him as their God. In praising David, they recognized the virtues of the monarch; in praising God, they celebrated powers and perfections characteristic of divinity.—But as the subject of worship will meet me in another department of this work, I shall say no more of it at present.

I cannot, however, pass over in silence the low attempt at ridicule in the p. 45, 46. There we are told our Lord had no more of Godhead in him than Baal had, because Mark tells us "*He was asleep on a pillow in the hinder part of the ship.*"* But did he
not

* In p. 45. He says to Mr Inglis, 'it may be left to your ingenuity to discover, that he was asleep and awake at the same time.' To discover this we have only to attend to the most common occurrences in life; as every man in a dream is in this very state. 'I sleep, but my heart or mind waketh,' requires very little ingenuity to understand it; and on the hypothesis of the soul's surviving the body—a hypothesis no man can clearly disprove—every man after death is asleep and awake at the same time. This author, too, furnishes a striking instance of this fact—When he writes his reason always sleeps.

not *awake*, and at the *prayer* of his disciples, rebuke the storm, and change it into a calm? Did Baal ever awake? Did he answer the prayer of his disciples?—Again, this ridicule is equally levelled against the God of the Jews --Ps. xliv. 23. “*awake, why sleepest thou, O Lord?*” —I add, although the Lord from heaven submitted to the weaknesses our flesh is heir to, in the days of his flesh, will it follow, That he is at any time *asleep*, now he is in heaven? No: vain man! He lives for ever, to make *continual* intercession for us. He is the shepherd of Israel, who slumbers not nor sleeps. This you will know by and bye; if the patience and long-suffering of God do not lead you to repentance---your “judgment lingereth not, and your damnation *slumbereth* not.”*

One

* As to his sermon by an Apostate Jew, it is far below the notice of criticism.—How weak is it to tell us; the Jews never mistook a visible man for an invisible God, never deified a man and worshipped a brother Jew! Did they not worship calves, stocks and stones? And was not this a greater mistake?—Again, How could they mistake Moses for a God? Did ever Jehovah say, I have made thee a God to Israel? Nevertheless he only made him a God to Pharaoh. And the meaning of that expression is explained in Ex. iv. 16. Thou shalt be to him *instead of* a God. Moses was appointed to act the part of God, in declaring the divine purposes with regard to Pharaoh, and in executing the divine judgments upon him and all his hosts. When Pharaoh died, then, this office of Moses must cease of itself.

To boast, then, as in p. 52. Is there a shadow of such a proof for the Deity of Jesus as is here laid before you for the eternal Godhead of Moses? Is such an insult on com-
mon

One circumstance renders the zeal of our modern reformers very suspicious—Like all other fanatics, they boast of martyred fathers, and glory in suffering persecution: yet they carefully confine their vociferations to countries, where Liberty affords them a safe asylum. Down with false Gods is the constant cry of the party. Yet the votaries of papal images, of the grand Lama, and of the rabble of other pagan deities still continue to worship unmolested. Against the Spirit of the living God, against the Son of

his mon sense as the most brutish and insolent of mankind will seldom venture to offer. Can a made God be eternal? One made a God only for a few days, and for one purpose, and to one man?—This Apostate Jew and our Apostate Christian are true brethren in folly and iniquity. To degrade Jesus so far below Moses; the son below the servant, as to make it blasphemous to ascribe to Jesus names, powers and perfections, which he allows to have been justly attributed to Moses, yea, to all magistrates over Israel, all of whom the Scriptures call Gods, (Ps. lxxxii. 1.)—this, I say, is such an outrage against heaven and the understandings of mankind, that it merits no serious reply—it deserves the most indignant contempt, and its author some conspicuous place in the *Dunciad*.

But although T. F. Palmer divests our Lord of the divine character, he has no exceptions against being made a God in his place. He claims authority to dictate to all men in matters of religion, and denounces all the judgments of heaven against all, who refuse to submit to his authority. Every Trinitarian is sentenced to the lake of fire, while no Unitarian can “have fellowship with Devils,” either in sin or punishment!—But I have read before of a man, who exalted “himself above all that is called God and is worshipped,” and of a beast rising out of the sea*, who had not properly ‘fellowship with Devils,’ as he claimed all the Devil had,—even “his power, his seat, and great authority.”

* Perhaps at Aberbrothwick.

his love, the Unitarian quiver exhausts its rage, and aims its every shaft!! These they term false Gods, and rejoice that they “are to be famished from off the earth!!!---Christians must read this with horror. This is the last effort of the Gates of hell against the religion of Jesus. But we can laugh at the idle attempt---we know who has said to the Son “Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever”---we know too who has promised that the Holy Spirit shall abide with us. “Grieve not then the Spirit of God---Kiss the son, lest he be angry, and ye perish, when his wrath is kindled a little.” Unitarians will curse you in so doing. Infatuated mortals! In a little even they must say---“Blessed are all they that put their trust in him.”

PART III.

An Address to real believers in Christ---On the Character of our Lord, and the respect due to it.

Dear Brethren,

THESE are the last days, in which perilous times are come. The spirit of Antichrist, the Scriptures have foretold, has appeared in various forms. In the form

form of despotism, he has long usurped authority over the consciences of men, substituting unmeaning forms and superstitious rites in the room of substantial godliness, and terrifying men into an implicit submission to his decrees, by all that is dreadful in this or the invisible world. This idol, however, which the see of Rome has so long supported, begins to totter on the throne. A gaudy superstition loses her charms, and a furious despotism its horrors, when the Light of Truth dawns on the minds of men. Yet the throne of iniquity is not vacated. Superstition may be deposed; but Scepticism fills her room. She chuses the Deist and the Socinian for her prime ministers—her chiefs in the cabinet and the field. Both agree to employ a sophistical philosophy in supplanting the religion of Jesus; but they differ in the mode of carrying their measures into execution. The Deist would take in the citadel by assault; the Socinian by stratagem: the one would plant a battery; the other would sink a mine: the former avows his inimical designs; the latter conceals them under the mask of friendship. Both have the same end; but differ with regard to the means.

The consequences of these different plans of attack may be easily foreseen. The proud philosopher and the man of rank, disdaining

to submit to be taught by Jesus of Nazareth, will readily embrace the maxims of the Deist, which flatter the pride of human nature, exalting it into an independent divinity. Such an open attack on the Scriptures of Truth, however, would alarm the minds and shock the feelings of men in the middle and lower walks of life, who have received these writings as divine oracles—the source of all their joys and hopes for time and eternity, and the rules by which they are to be judged at the last day. Against these the Socinian must be employed—the man, who, as he is possessed of all the poison, has also all the subtilty of the serpent. The light of reason, the religion of nature must be held forth as the *standard* of truth; yet Revelation must not be discarded. Her peculiar doctrines, indeed, must be abandoned, as not according with this imaginary *standard*; but her moral precepts must be retained, not as of divine authority, but as agreeable to the dictates of Dame Natural Reason. Under a pretext of zeal for the divine Unity, the Son of God, the author of Revelation, must be degraded into a mere man, the son of a carpenter, a fallible man like ourselves; that his disciples may by degrees lose their confidence in his promises, and veneration for his character. Moses and all the rulers of Israel may be justly called gods, but if you apply this name to
Jesus

Jesus Christ the pulpit and press will be set in an uproar—Blasphemy! Idolatry! oh! oh! oh!——The necessity of the operations of the spirit of God must be also set aside. Man is fully able to save himself; and who does not see that if God works in us to will and to do of his good pleasure, our *worthy* selves would be robbed of the honour of working out our own salvation. In this case we must join the song of these mean-spirited Beings in the Revelation, who sing “Worthy is the Lamb, that was slain, and has redeemed us to God by his blood:” and what man of spirit would have the pride of his glory so stained? Even angels chused hell with all its horrors, rather than submit to such indignity.

By arts like these, my brethren, Infidelity attempts an establishment among us. What need have we then, to beware lest satan get an advantage of us, as he has so many devices against us! It must be of the highest importance, in particular, to have just ideas of the character of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the station he holds in the universe, as this is the key to the whole book of God, the centre of all the lines of divine truth, to which all the Prophets and all the Apostles give witness. Of this the enemy is well aware. Hence to obscure ‘the brightness of the Father’s glory;’ to draw a cloud

over the sun of our souls, lest we should behold 'the glory of God shining in the face of Jesus Christ'—is the grand aim of the devil. Permit me, then, to put you in mind of a few plain passages of sacred writ, which may tend to stablish your faith in the pre-existence and divinity of our Saviour, in whom we have believed.

His pre-existence is most expressly asserted in his own words—John vi. 38, 41, 62. "I came down from heaven—I am that bread which came down from heaven——What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before? chap. iii. 13. No man hath ascended into heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man, who is,—or as the present participle is often used for the past—who *was* in heaven. xvi. 28. I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again I leave the world and go to the Father. xvii. 5. Now, O Father, glorify me with thine own self, with the glory I had with thee before the world was."——John Baptist was a prophet, and had his commission from heaven; yet neither he nor any of the other prophets says---I came down from heaven. So far from this, John makes this the peculiar characteristic of his Lord——'He that cometh from above, is above all---he that cometh from heaven, is above all. John iii. 31.——

Many

Many other Scriptures of the same import might be added, as to this truth all the Prophets and Apostles give witness: but the above are so express, so unequivocal in their evidence, that they leave no rational foundation for doubt. Even the Jews, the children of the devil, did not misunderstand them; although they join with their Socinian brethren in not believing them. Both call God a liar----“Because I tell you the truth you will not believe me,” is equally true of both. Truth opposes their prejudices, therefore they must oppose Truth.

You may now ask the Socinians, Supposing our Lord to have meant to say that he was *personally* in heaven before the world was, and that he *personally* came down from heaven, in what plainer words could he possibly have expressed himself? And is it possible, that any man of plain sense, any who has not some bad end to serve, could understand these words in any other sense? This ends the controversy. If they tell you, When Christ says I came down from heaven, he must be understood *metaphorically*; but when he says, I go to heaven, I ascend to my Father, he is to be understood *literally*---this is to call you an idiot; as no rational creature can assent to such a commentary. T. F. Palmer says ‘I came forth from England, and am come into Scotland: again I

leave Scotland, and go to England.' How would he stare, if some learned commentator would argue thus, Mr Palmer never was in England; therefore the first clause of this text must be explained metaphorically, as it only means that he had his mission as an Unitarian prophet from England: but the last clause must be taken in a literal sense, as he intends personally to return to England.---- Why should an Unitarian stare at this comment, when he daily puts the same brutish and nonsensical interpretation on the words of the Most High?

In his pre-existent state, Paul says he was "in the form of God;" and in this form John calls him the Logos, the Revealer of the invisible Nature of Deity, in whom alone the creature can see or know any thing of God. This character he did not put off, when he assumed our nature. He divested himself, indeed, of that visible glory, which belonged to him "as the only begotten of the Father;" yet even in our flesh he still was the Logos or Word tabernacled in us; and now he is again glorified with that glory, which he had before the world was. Now,

That our Saviour is called God, in the above character, is so evident as to admit of no rational doubt. In Matthew c. i. 23. He is called "Emmanuel, God with us."

John

John in the beginning of his gospel tells us The Logos, who afterwards took part of our flesh and blood, was in the beginning with God, "and was God." God and the Creator are synonymous terms, and in the same passage we are told, "By him were all things created." Paul says the same, Col. i. 16. "By him were all things created, that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible---all things were created by him and for him. And he is before all things, and by him all things consist." The same Apostle expressly calls him God, Rom. ix. 5. "Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever." Heb. i. 8. "Unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever." And in Rev. i. 11. He says, "I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last," which in ver. 8. is the character of "the Almighty."—What insolence, then, must that be, that could say, "Shew me the text where it is said of Christ as it is of Moses, that God had made him a God." It is no where said, God made him a God: but we have seen a variety of texts, in which the Scriptures expressly call him God.

But the Socinians not only err in denying the divinity of Christ—their ideas of his humanity are no less unscriptural. They tell us, that the second man, by whom comes the resurrection of the dead, is in no respect

respect materially different from Adam, the man by whom death came; but with respect to their natures, there is no material distinction. Yea, Dr Priestly says, That our Lord was a child of the old Adam, in all respects, being begotten by Joseph, the husband of Mary! And so brutish are these mortals, that in a discourse published at Cambridge, (1787) on 1 Cor. xv. 21. the author avers that Paul, in speaking of Adam and Christ, with respect to their natures, has mentioned no material distinction between them, which he certainly would have done, had he known any. What this writer calls material I know not; but if his bigotry would have permitted him to read downward to the 44, 45, 47th verses of that chapter, he would have found the most marked constitutional distinction.—“There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body. And so it is written, The first man Adam, was made a living soul; the last Adam, a quickening spirit. The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven.” If this be no material distinction, what can be so called? The flesh and blood he took in the Virgin was ours, indeed; but he, who took part of it, was the divine Logos, the Lord from heaven, the enlivening spirit, having life in himself, even as the Father has life in himself.

I proceed

I proceed now to set before you what the scripture says, with regard to the respect, to the honour or worship due to this character of our Lord Jesus Christ.

To worship one, is to ascribe to him the glory due to his name, or character, and that by words expressive of veneration for his excellencies, or by bodily gesture, or kissing the hand, bowing, kneeling or falling down, &c. We often read in the scriptures of this worship or honour being paid to men, eminent in station or virtues; nor is there any fault found with this practice, while no excellence was ascribed to a man, but what is human, and what he really possessed. But if they ascribed divine perfections to any man or to an image, this is reprobated in the strongest terms, as giving God's glory to another, and his praise to graven images. Thus when Israel "worshipped the Lord and the king," this is mentioned with approbation, as they ascribed to each only what was due to ^{their} character: but when they ascribed ^{divine} perfections to stars or graven images, ^{they} are charged with idolatry and blasphemy. While Herod claimed the honours of a king, no harm befell him; but when he challenged the honours of a God, he provoked the divine vengeance, and was eaten of worms.

To

By divine excellencies we mean personal perfections or attributes, no creature possesses, or works, no creature can perform. To worship God, then, is to ascribe to him, confess or acknowledge that he is possessed of such perfections as belong not to the creature, or that he has performed such works as no creature, man nor angel, can do. Creative energy; wisdom to lay the whole plan of things, and power to uphold and carry all into execution: sovereignty in forming his plan and in disposing every part of it at his pleasure; Love passing knowledge, and goodness extending to all his works; justice in distributing rewards and punishments to the whole universe; to exist from eternity to eternity; in short, to exist as no other exists, to act as no creature acts, and to speak as no man speaks—these are a part of that immensity of perfections which characterize divinity.---These are claimed by the God of the Scriptures, in the character he gives of himself, and these he requires to be ascribed to him by all his creatures.

In scripture, we find this worship performed, 1st. by *Invocation*, which means, a prayer, an address to a superior being, or calling upon him for assistance.---“In my distress I called on God—call ye on his name,” are expressions frequent in David’s Psalms. 2dly, By *thanksgiving* or praise, in which,
with

with reverence and gratitude, we acknowledge or confess to him his perfections and works, celebrating them in songs. These are called “sacrifices of praise, calves of the lips.” 3dly, By bestowing the gifts he has entrusted with us, in the manner, and for the purposes, he has enjoined, and that for his name’s sake, “To do good and to communicate, forget not: for with such sacrifices God is well pleased.” 4thly, By making his deeds known to others, publishing and declaring all his mighty works, speaking of his salvation all the day. This is often joined with praise and prayer——“Give thanks to God; call on his name, to men his deeds make known-----proclaim all his wondrous works.” Thus preaching is as much a part of worship as prayer or praise.

It remains now, that we should enquire, whether, by scripture precept or example, we are warranted to offer any worship of this kind to our Lord Jesus Christ.

In this enquiry, it is necessary to keep in mind, That divine perfections and works lay the foundation for a claim to divine worship, and that divine works suppose divine perfections. Now our Saviour tells us, that he performs all the works of the Father---“My Father worketh hitherto, and I work---For whatsoever things he doth, these also doth the Son likewise.” John v.

17, 19. Are all things of the Father as their original, Paul tells us all things are by the Son, as the immediate source of their existence and preservation. 1 Cor. viii. 6. "The Father, of whom are **all** things, and we in (or for) him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him." Thus whatever the Father planned, or divine wisdom designed, the Son has executed by power. By him were all things created at first, and by him all things consist, as the whole created machine is upheld, and carried forward to its destined purposes by and through his agency. Raising the dead is a repeated exertion of creative energy; and this is equally the claim of the Father and the Son. "For as the Father raiseth the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will." John v. 21.---Thus we find creative energy in all its forms exerted by the Son; and all this is the result of divine perfections of "life in himself, as the Father hath life in himself." In him dwells all the fulness of the Godhead---all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, and that *bodily*. So that all that is justly called God and worshipped is in Christ Jesus. He is in the Father and the Father in him; and the Spirit of the Father and of the Son is one and the same spirit.

fus.

Thus all divine perfections are in, and inseparably connected with the man Christ Jesus. We are told, indeed, all these were given him of the Father: and how could they be in him *bodily* otherwise. He had not our flesh and blood before his birth of the virgin; nor does it appear that the divine Logos was fully united to the manhood before his resurrection from the dead, when only he became Lord both of the dead and of the living, and fills ALL in ALL. Hence it is easy to see, that this fulness must have been given him, or imparted to him in the body of our flesh, else it could not have been in him *bodily*.—What ignorance or what insolence, then, could say, “Elijah, Peter and Paul raised the dead, and so are Gods too?” They never claimed any such power. Did they ever say they had life in themselves, and a power to quicken whom they would? No: the words they uttered, on these occasions, were uttered by the divine command, and the power that produced the effect was not in them—it was the power of God.

On these divine perfections and powers he had *in himself*, our Lord founds his claim to divine honours. The Son raises the dead, has life in himself and has all judgment committed to him, “That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father.” John xv. 23. And to caution his
H disciples

disciples in all ages against Socinian ideas, who imagine that they can worship the Father abstractly considered, while they worship not the Son, he adds "He that honour-eth not the Son, honoureth not the Father." This law is not only given to men; but Paul tells us "When he bringeth in his first-begotten into the world, he saith, Let all the angels of God worship him." Such is the law of worship promulgated by heaven to angels and to men—a law founded on the highest reason, as no creature can see or know God, but as he is manifested in the person of Jesus Christ. What, then, shall we think of these heaven-daring mortals, who attempt to reverse the edict of heaven? Who, when they speak of the only-begotten Son of God, say—Let neither men nor angels worship him?

Such is the law—and corresponding thereto is the practice of all the true worshippers. 1st. As to *Invocation*—calling on the Lord Jesus, or on his name, is the very characteristic of the saints. 1 Cor. i. 2. "Unto the church of God at Corinth—with all that in every place *call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord.*" Again, "The same Lord over all, is rich unto all that *call upon him.* For whosoever shall *call upon the name of the Lord,* shall be saved." Rom. x. 12, 13. See also Acts ix. 14, 21.—Such is the general character

rafter—nor are examples wanting. When Paul prays for heavenly blessings to descend upon the churches, he connects the Father and the Son in his invocation, or address to heaven for them. “Grace, mercy and peace be to you from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.” Rom. i. 7. 1 Cor. i. 3. 2 Cor. i. 2. Gal. i. 3. Eph. i. 2. Philip. i. 2, &c. Sometimes he invokes the Son only—“The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all:” at other times the invocation is addressed to Father, Son and Holy Spirit. “The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of the Father, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all.”

The above are examples of invocation more *indirect*; the following are *direct* or *immediate* addresses to both Father and Son. “Now God himself, even our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ direct our way unto you.” 1 Theff. iii. 11. And in the following verses he directly invokes Jesus the Lord—“And the Lord make you to increase and abound in love towards one another—To the end he may establish your hearts unblameable in holiness before God even our Father.” Again, “Now our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God even our Father—comfort your hearts and establish you in every good word and work.” 2 Theff. ii. 16, 17. From these instances, it is evident, That not

a single blessing descends from the Father, but it at the same time comes from the Son ; and therefore our eyes in prayer must be directed to both. Nor does this divide our attention in worship at all—as the Father is in the Son, and the Son in the Father ; nor can we know or see any thing of God but as in Christ, who alone is “ God with us.”

The example of the dying Stephen is also full to our purpose. Acts vii. 59, 60. “ They stoned Stephen, calling or invoking and saying—Lord Jesus, receive my spirit. And he kneeled down and cried with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge.” The words *upon God* in our version are supplementary. The Lord Jesus, then, is the object of this invocation ; as also in the last of the holy volume—“ Amen ; even so come, Lord Jesus.”——This is calling on the name of the Lord Jesus—invoking him not as a creature, but as him, whose are the spirits of all flesh, who can receive our spirits. And can a mere man do so ?

What shall we then think of the effrontery of that assertion in p. 246 of the Christian Miscellany for June, 1792.—Wherever the phrase “ calling on the name of the Lord is used, no more is meant by it, but professing to believe in Christ !” The falsehood of this assertion is obvious even to a babe in Christ. —It is added, indeed, “ Nothing can be
more

more forced than to say, that when Ananias said to Saul, ' Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord,' he intended to direct him to offer up prayer to Christ. What connection has the praying to Christ, with Saul's being baptized, and washing away his sins?" I answer, a very strong connection---The blood of Jesus Christ the Son cleanses us from all sin; and Christ has a power to forgive sin. How, then, could Saul get his sins washed away in baptism but by this blood; and who should bless this ordinance of baptism for this end, but the Lord, who instituted it? Who appointed it, not as Moses, a servant; but "as a Son over his own house?" It was certainly as proper for Saul to pray to Christ on this occasion for washing from his sins, as it was for Stephen, when dying, to call upon him to receive his spirit.

These blind zealots draw their chief argument, against any religious address to our Saviour, from John xvi. 23. "In that day ye shall ask me nothing: Verily, verily, I say to you, Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you." Here, say they, our Lord expressly forbids prayers to be offered up to him, charging his disciples to pray only to the Father in his name.---As the whole stress of the Socinian argument lies here, permit me, my brethren,

to call your particular attention to the following observations ;

1st. When our Lord says ' In that day ye shall ask me nothing,' he must mean, that they had asked him formerly, during his abode among them ; as thus the future time is to be distinguished from the past. If they had never asked him any thing, it would be absurd or at least idle to say, after this ye shall ask me nothing. If, then, *asking* in this text means *praying*, as the Socinians will have it, the consequence is obvious---our Lord permitted the disciples to pray to him, in the days of his flesh, and so encouraged idolatry : or if it was no idolatry to pray to him in the days of his humiliation, these Magi must shew us, How it becomes idolatrous to pray to him in glory.

2dly. The verb rendered *ask*, in the first clause is very different from the word so rendered in the last clause of this verse. *Ereotao* generally signifies *to make an enquiry*, and *aiteo* *to present a petition or request*. While he was with them, the disciples *enquired* at him the sense of many parables and dark dispensations, some of which he had been explaining to them in this discourse. But now, says he, I ascend to heaven, so that ye shall not have me with you to instruct you, yet this shall be no disadvantage to you, as I will send you the spirit of truth, who will teach you all things,

things, and among the rest How to pray. This does not say that they should not pray to him.

3dly. He is here teaching them his mediatory character, or that they should ask the Father in his name. In this view they had not seen him before. In the light they had regarded him, or while in his humiliation, it would not have become him to have required worship to be offered to himself, although he never refused it when offered.

4thly, Even in this very discourse he tells them, that he had spoken to them in parables or darkly—‘ These things have I spoken to you in parables.’ ver. 25. Consequently here he only tells them part of the truth, not the whole. Something was left in the dark even on the subject of prayer, (for this is the subject he is speaking on) which would not be explained till the spirit came. The Spirit alone taught them the *Divinity* of his character, in which respect alone he is the object of *divine* worship. When this inward teacher had shewen them the divinity of their Lord, he shewed them also the respect due to him. This is the mystery which he tells them he would reveal after his ascension, when he would no more speak to them in parables, but plainly. Accordingly, we have seen in a variety of instances, and in others not quoted, that after the spirit came,

came, the disciples although they generally address the Father, as the ultimate object of worship, yet they sometimes addressed the Son alone, as having all the Godhead in him, and at other times, the Father and the Son conjunctly.

5thly, If we explain this clause ‘ In that day ye shall ask me nothing,’ as forbidding us *to pray to Christ*, we must, by the same rule, explain verses 27, and 29, as telling us that Christ *will not pray for us*. He who said, ‘ In that day ye shall ask me nothing,’ said at the same time, ‘ I say not to you, that I will pray the Father for you;’ and thus we must deny the intercession of Christ also. But let us explain verse 23, as even Socinians explain verses 26, and 27, and all is clear. It is allowed, that the meaning of these two last verses is, I say not that I will pray the Father for you, as if he was not of himself disposed to give you what you need—“ For the Father himself loves you.” I will, indeed, pray the Father, not as if this was necessary to *dispose* him to bless you; but because this is the constituted medium for conveying blessings to you. In the same manner, when he says, ‘ In that day ye shall ask me nothing,’ he means—Ye will have no need to ask any thing of me, as if I loved you better or would be more ready to bestow blessings upon you, than

than the Father; for I tell you, 'The Father loves you, and whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you.'—Thus as he does not restrict himself from praying for us in the one passage, neither does he prohibit us from praying to him in the other.

6thly, If the Socinian interpretation of this passage be admitted, we must deny That the Holy Spirit guided the Apostles into all truth, in the exercises of divine worship. In short, we must say, That Paul lived, and Stephen died in an unwarrantable, yea in an idolatrous practice!

II. *Thanksgiving*, expressed in psalms, hymns and spiritual songs, constitutes another essential part of divine worship. That this is offered to Christ, as well as to the Father, in the sacred volume, is so obvious, that it demands effrontery indeed to deny it. The victories and triumphs of our Lord are celebrated in many of David's and other Old Testament Psalms. In the 47th Psalm, we are called to sing praises to our king—and who is he? "God is gone up with a shout; Jehovah with the sound of the trumpet:" and in this triumph all lands are concerned, ver. 1. And had all people any concern in any exaltation of David? But in that of Jesus all had. The Apostle Paul frequently views his Lord simply in the character of a mediator

mediator between God and man ; in which view he offers up thanks to the Father through him, and charges us “ By him to offer up the sacrifice of praise to God continually : ” yet at other times his thanksgivings are immediately addressed to Jesus Christ. Thus in 1 Tim. i. 12. “ I thank Jesus Christ our Lord, who hath enabled me, for that he counted me faithful, &c. ” But the most striking and full exemplification of this fact is to be found in the Revelation of John. In the beginning of that most important of all prophecies, John prays for grace and peace not from the Father only, and the Spirit in his seven-fold energy, but also from Jesus Christ, c. i. 4, 5, To him he sings a hymn of praise—“ Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, &c. ” Here Jesus is addressed both as the object of *prayer* and *praise*. In the 5th chapter we have a most striking representation of heavenly worship. When the Lamb appears in the midst of the throne, the redeemed hosts *fall down prostrate* before him, and this is the highest external sign of worship, whereby we are called to “ glorify God in our bodies. ” Then in chorus they sing a new song——“ Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof : for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, &c. ” Instantly the
the

the angels, with a loud voice, sing¹ their part of the anthem—"Worthy is the Lamb, that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing."—Alas! alas! says a Socinian, Has idolatry got into heavenly places also! A dreadful affair indeed! Pity it is that our pamphlets cannot ascend there—they would soon reform religion even in heaven, as they have already done in earth, and consign these hymns to eternal oblivion. —Child of Lucifer! Read on, and feel a keener hell within thee. Thy pride would rather chuse annihilation, than to sing hymns to the Lamb. Yet if thy existence be continued, thou must join in the following part of this sacred song: for, says John, "*every creature* which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, blessing, and honour, and glory, and praise, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever."

Here we find every perfection, every honour, that is ascribed to the Father, ascribed equally to the Son; as also in chapter 7, ver. 10. where the great multitude of the redeemed cry with a loud voice, "Salvation be ascribed to our God, who sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb."—These instances

stances indisputably ascertain the sense of John v. 23. "All men should honour the Son *even as* they honour the Father." If *power* over universal Nature, and a right to dispose of all the *riches* or *blessings* it contains; if unerring *wisdom* and invincible *strength*; if all *honour* and *glory* belong to the Father, the same are ascribed to the Son. Yea, if life itself and a power to quicken whom he wills, comprehending all essential powers and perfections, be the property of the one, it is also the claim of the other. Equal perfections justly claim equal honour. To tell us, then, that the honour the Son claims is essentially different from that which is the unalienable prerogative of the Supreme Being, is to explain away the most obvious sense of language, and to blaspheme the Hosts of Worshippers who dwell in heaven.

But says the *Christian Miscellany*, p. 242. you do 'not advert to the peculiar circumstances, under which these ascriptions of praise were made, viz. in a scenical representation; nor reflect, that what was transacted in a vision, where Christ was supposed to be present, can be no precedent for christians, his followers, to address prayer or praise to him, or to suppose him every where present to hear them.' To this I reply—Is this a representation of a fact or of a lie? Certainly of a fact, otherwise the
 Scriptures

Scriptures are calculated to mislead us in our most important concerns. In a vision John must have beheld it, as he could see it no other way—but it was a divine vision. Again, this allows the propriety of addressing prayer and praise to Christ when he is present to hear them. But you say that to offer prayers or praises to Christ is as abominable and damnable Idolatry as to worship Baal or any other idol! yet when he is present it is lawful to worship him! Strange ideas these! To worship Christ in heaven is lawful and just—to worship him on earth idolatry! When he appears again, it seems Socinians themselves will worship him?—Will become good Trinitarians!—Men writing in this manner are visionaries indeed; but they have not “seen the visions of the Almighty.”

It may be added, We are taught to pray That the divine Will may be done on earth *as it is* in heaven. But it is admitted that in heaven the adoring hosts worship the Lamb as well as his Father; consequently this must also be done on earth by all true worshippers. It is very honest in the Socinians to tell us, That they, like witches in story, invert the Lord's prayer, saying Let not thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven!

I

Besides,

Besides, Paul says, ‘ We *see* Jesus---Faith is the substance of things unseen—Moses endured, as *seeing* him who is invisible,’ or unseen by mortal eyes. What, then, although Christ be unseen by the eye of flesh ; we see him by faith, which substantiates the unseen world to us. Thus *we see* Jesus, and consequently, even on the Socinian plan, it is lawful to worship him.

But, say they, ‘ he is not present to hear you.’ How then can he offer up our prayers to, or intercede for us with the Father ? or how can he judge the secrets of all men at the last day ? Why does he say to the churches in Asia ‘ I know thy works—I am he who searcheth the reins and hearts ; and I will give unto every one of you according to your works ?’ Why said he to his disciples ‘ Lo, I am with you always even to the end of the world ? While we believe these words, it is impossible we can doubt whether Christ be present to hear us or not. Yes, my brethren, the Socinians imagine he hears them not ; and in one respect I dare say this is true : but “ this is the confidence we have in him, that if we ask any thing according to his will *he heareth us*. And if we know he heareth us, whatsoever we ask, we know that we have the petitions which we desired of him.” John’s 1 Ep. v. 14. 15.

Thus

Thus I think it plain, beyond a rational dispute, that prayers and praises are to be offered up to Christ and to the Father by or through him. The Son is the immediate object of attention in worship, as through him alone our services can ascend to the Father, who is only glorified in the Son.

But we are required to offer still more costly sacrifices to Jesus, or for his sake—Houses, lands, wife, children---every worldly interest, yea life itself.—Since Socinians will not join Paul in saying “*I thank Jesus Christ*” for benefits received; how will they offer these much more expensive sacrifices for his name’s sake? yet these must be offered at his command, else he assures us we are none of his.

We saw also, that declaring the name of God, making his deeds known, is a part of worship equally required of us as prayer and praise. But this is as strongly enjoined by Jesus Christ, with respect to himself. Hence to preach Christ crucified, to preach the gospel of Christ, to declare his doings among the nations for the obedience of faith, was the constant employ of his disciples: and as the name of the Father is in him, he that confesses the Son, that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, ‘he hath both the Father and the Son.’

I shall only add on this point, That there is one act of christian worship, in which Christ must be the object of our principal regards. ‘Do this,’ said he, ‘in remembrance *of me*; for this is my body broken for you, and this my blood, shed for the remission of the sins of many.’ Here all we see, all we partake of, is Christ; why then should it not be done in memory of him? Did Moses say—Eat the paschal lamb in remembrance of me? No: Moses did not give Israel his flesh to eat, nor was his blood shed for the remission of their sins; and so had no claim to be remembered in the service of the passover. But in the Lord’s supper, the atonement, the reconciliation, the putting away of sin by the sacrifice of himself, of him, who ‘loved us and gave himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God of a sweet smelling favour’—these are the chief objects of christian attention.—Thus we eat and worship him, who is the governour among the nations. He is our Lord, and let us worship him, regardless of all the curses, of all the thunders of the see of Socinus.

We are upbraided, also by these zealous reformers, for regarding a Trinity in our religious services.—I have no intention at present to enter upon a metaphysical discussion of this subject,—not because I consider the idea repugnant to sound philosophy, but
because

because I mean to treat of it at large in another work. A mercy it is, that such a disquisition is not necessary to the generality of christians; to whom a 'Thus saith the Lord' is a sufficient foundation for faith. Divine faith must respect the divine testimony: and he must either be an ignorant or biased reader of the sacred records indeed, if he does not find there, that it is impossible to offer any acceptable worship to heaven, without respecting a trinity. We are initiated into the church of God, and profess subjection to the gospel, by being baptized "into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit;" and that by the authority of the Lord of all. Here is a Trinity undoubtedly, which we must regard in baptism. In all our addresses to the heavenly throne the same Trinity must be regarded: for Paul assures us "Through *Christ* we have an access by *one Spirit* unto the *Father*." Eph. ii. 18. If every good and perfect gift comes down from the father of lights; Christ ascended on high that he might 'give gifts to men,' and "out of his fulness we all have received, even grace for grace." The same blessings are communicated by the Holy Spirit---'all these worketh that one and the self same spirit, dividing to every man severally *as he wills*.' Hence we are blessed in the name of the same Trinity---Paul prays that 'the

grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the fellowship or communion of the Holy Spirit may be with us all.'

Metaphysicians, then, may dispute about the abstract essence, consubstantiality, personality, identity and distinction of these Three, till they are lost in a labyrinth of mazy errors. But whatever become of these intricate subtelties, while the above texts are found in our bible, christians are at no loss to find That our salvation, all that can make us happy here and hereafter, is *of* the Father, *through* the Son and *by* the Holy Spirit. To this idea of a Trinity every true christian must say——*Amen.*

CONCLUSION.

I Shall now offer a few Reflections on what has been said in the foregoing pages.

I.

It is impossible that the Socinian worship can be acceptable to God. We know who has said 'In vain do ye worship me, teaching for doctrine the commandments of men.' We know also, that the established law of heaven, with respect to worship, is 'That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father.' This is the law given to men: the same too is directed to angels—
' Let

‘ Let all the angels of God worship him.’ Accordingly we have found the practice of the redeemed from the earth, and of adoring angels exactly conformed to this heavenly edict. But this edict the Socinians attempt to reverse, saying, Let neither man nor angel honour the Son as they honour the Father. This is surely a commandment of men, although issued from the *Racovian* See. The consequence is obvious—‘ In vain’ do the Socinians worship the Father; for ‘ he that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father.’

I remember, about 30 years ago, I heard a venerable old clergyman* say in his sermon—*Would you know, you wicked folk, how high your prayers go? They never go higher than that*—pointing with his finger to the crown of his head.—I dare aver, Even Dr Priestly’s famous printed prayer never will ascend the nineteenth part of an inch higher.

II.

What strange ideas must the Socinians entertain concerning Jesus Christ. They view him as a *mere* man—not only so, but they must view him as a very bad man. By a variety of persons, and on a variety of occasions, was he worshipped on earth: nor do we once read of his rejecting these honours. He received them without a single mark of disapprobation.

* The late Mr Cleveland of Buchlyvie.

disapprobation. On the contrary, when worship was offered to Peter, Paul and Barnabas, they rejected it in the most pointed terms of abhorrence. Nor would an angel suffer John the Divine to fall down at his feet to worship him—"See thou do it not; for I am thy fellow-servant and of thy brethren the prophets--Worship God." If our Lord, then, was only a mere man, a fellow-servant of the Prophets and Apostles, how far was he their inferior in piety! He countenanced idolatry; and therefore, although to serve the low designs of an insidious party, the Socinians still continue to call him "our blessed Lord," it is probable they will soon throw off the mask, so thin that it is not worth the wearing, and join openly with their brethren the Jews, saying, "Nay; but he deceiveth the people."

Again, If, as Socinians say, our Saviour was *only* a prophet or teacher, who does not see that mankind are more indebted to his Apostles, in that character, than to him? He confined his ministrations to Judea; nor did he commit his Instructions to writing, for the behoof of other nations and other ages. His success, too, was very trifling: few believed his report, or admitted his credentials as of divine authority. But his Apostles not only preached, but wrote the important truths for generations yet unborn

—Bursting

---Bursting over the narrow confines of Judea, they imparted the instructions of wisdom to the surrounding nations, and called all men to behold the salvation of God. The success of their labours, also, was very great: multitudes believed their doctrines, and turned from dead idols to serve the living God. Nor did they simply repeat the lessons of their master: to these they added many truths he had not taught them while on earth at all. Now as the Socinians do not believe, that Christ after he ascended sent his Spirit to his Apostles to teach them or lead them into all truth (for what spirit has a mere man to send) they must consider the Apostles as far superior to their Lord in every respect. Dr Priestly denies the inspiration of the Apostles as Writers; consequently all they taught was the effort of natural abilities; which exalts their character high indeed. But had they taught Socinianism, the Dr would have allowed them a *plenary* inspiration, and admitted their writings as "decisive in religious controversy."

III.

What a weak, capricious, absurd being is the Socinian God! Dwelling in the gloomy solitude of his own essence, he governed the universe alone, without any associate, till about 1800 years ago. Then, as if superannuated, he took a fancy for a Jewish boy,
the

the son of a carpenter, whom, after he had subjected him to ignominy, torments and death in the most hideous form, for no rational purpose, he exalted to the heavenly throne, and entrusted in his hands the reins of the universe with all the fulness thereof. Yet so ill-qualified is this Vice-roy for his task, that as he sits always on his throne, and so has his personal knowledge confined to a very narrow limit, he knows neither his subjects nor their affairs in any distant province but by report. So far is he from searching the heart, or trying the reins of men, that he has no personal knowledge of a single action done on earth for 1700 years past. Yet he is appointed to judge the world in righteousness on a future day!---Besides, although Socinus' God has lodged all fulness in this favourite's hand, yet if any creature presume to ask a single favour of him, or to offer a song to his honour, he is instantly sentenced to the lake of fire, which burns for ever and ever!—Is this the God and the Christ of the universe? Is this the religion of Rationals? Forbid it heaven! Forbid it, common sense!

When Pharaoh of Egypt chused a substitute in his government, he fixed on a man equal to himself in every talent of head and heart, necessary to fill so important a station, with honour to himself and advantage to the

the

the subject. And having entrusted all the treasures of Egypt in his hand, so far was he from prohibiting his subjects from asking a supply for their wants from his Vice-roy, that when the people asked any thing of himself, "Pharaoh said to all the Egyptians, Go unto Joseph; what he saith to you, do."

—If Moses was made a God to Pharaoh, Pharaoh, in point of wisdom and propriety of conduct, might be a God to the God of Socinus.

IV.

In what light must we view this Sectary? T. F. Palmer tells us, they are brethren of the Jews, who are infidels with respect to christianity, and of whom our Lord says "Ye are of your father the devil." The devil was a liar from the beginning, questioning the language of God, rejecting its most obvious meaning, and wresting it into one which common sense proclaims could never be intended by such language from such a Being: and is not this the great business of Socinians? They have changed the whole truth of God into a lie.---Again, Dr Priestly tells us, That he has frequently declared himself "not to be a believer in the inspiration of the Evangelists and Apostles as writers:" yea he denies the *plenary* inspiration of our Lord himself. What can a Deist do more?

more? Mahomet went not half so far. How base, then, to call himself a Christian!

Thus, in the words of a great Writer, the Dr “appears before us at this moment, a striking and solemn evidence himself, that to deny the divinity of our Saviour, does, by the necessary impulse of endeavouring to vindicate the denial, by the judicial curse of God upon the redoubled impiety, and by a precipitate gradation of absurdity from both, draw the mind at last, to deny the very inspiration of all our scriptural Writers; to deny even the very inspiration of our grand and oral Teacher himself, and consequently to charge both, with *Folly* and with *Falshood* in their instructions; so to shelter finally from reputation, in the blasphemies of Judaism, of Heathenism, and of Hell.”

F I N I S.

18 AP 68

